

The Classical Review

OCTOBER 1897.

NOTES TO THE *AGRICOLA* OF TACITUS.

Agr. 4, 15: *studium philosophiae acrius, ultra quam concessum Romano ac senatori, hausisse.*

The reading of the MSS. is quite generally retained. But 'ultra-senatori,' as an asyndetic epexegetis, wedged in between *acrius* and *hausisse*, which belong together, seems extremely awkward, nor can *ultra* well be separated from the rest of the clause and joined asyndetically to *acrius*. I therefore believe that Baehrens has for once been right in demanding *ultraque* (cod. A *ultra q*), a very easy emendation, the error being due to haplography, but I cannot accept Baehrens' reason for the correction, as the 'asyndeton bimembre,' even of synonyms, for so he regards *acrius* and *ultra*, is common enough in Tacitus.¹

That *ac senatori* 'and a senator at that' is quite inapplicable to the youthful Agricola has been pointed out by Peerkamp, but with that wanton recklessness, so characteristic of him, he atheizes the entire clause. It seems more reasonable to regard only *ac senatori* as a very natural gloss of some ancient reader which subsequently crept into the text.

Agr. 6, 15: *idem praeturae certior et silentium.*

Among the numerous substitutes suggested for the unintelligible reading of the MSS., such as *otium*, *terror*, *torpor*, *languor*, *secretum*, only *tenor*, the emendation of *Rhenanus*, has met with general favour. It unquestionably gives an excellent sense, and the expression is to a certain measure sup-

ported by analogies in other writers, notably Livy. Cf. e.g. IV. 10, 9 *consulatus eodem tenore gesti* VII. 32, 16, 40, 9 VIII. 38, 11 XXII. 15, 1 XL. 12. Ovid *Her.* XVII. 14. Plin. *Pan.* 91, 6. And yet this conjecture, ingenious as it is, ought not to have been accepted.

In the first place, no one, I fancy, will seriously contend, that the corruption from *tenor* to *certior* has the slightest palaeographical probability. In the second place, *tenor* occurs nowhere else in Tacitus; but to thrust a *ἄραξ εἰρημνών* into an ancient author, simply because it happens to satisfy the sense, is a very questionable proceeding and scarcely, if ever, justifiable on any methodical grounds.

Hence, if the passage is not to be given up in despair, as a 'locus insanabilis,' we must find some word which plausibly accounts for the existing corruption and at the same time satisfies what is felt to be the meaning of the author. Such a word, I am convinced, is *rektor*, out of which *certior* arose by *metathesis*, just as we find in a number of MSS. to Hor. *Ep.* II. 1, 105 *certis* erroneously written for *rectis*. *Rector* and similarly *regere* are often used in the sense of 'to administer,' both in Tacitus and elsewhere. The meaning of the entire passage would then be: Agricola administered (conducted) his praetorship in the same quiet manner as his earlier offices, and in consequence² there was the same dearth of noteworthy features. The collocation of a concrete and abstract

¹ Cf. *Joh. Müller*, Beiträge zur Kritik u. Erklärung des Tacitus I. pp. 6 ff.

NO. XCIX. VOL. XI.

² The *et* is epexegetic, as in *Dial.* 36, 10 *leges assidue et populare nomen*. See my note to *Dial.* 7, 16 (p. 106).

noun (*rector et silentium*) is peculiarly Tacitean. Not to go beyond the 'smaller works,' we may compare *Agr.* 24, 11. 25, 7. 28, 4. 38, 1 *G.* 7, 15. 33, 7.

Agr. 6, 17: *ludos et inania honoris medio rationis atque abundantiae duxit.*

A much disputed passage. I shall not here dwell upon the meaning of *duxit* which, in spite of what has been written about it,¹ may, without any violence, be taken in the sense of *edere*, although generally so used only with '*funus, exsequiae*' and the like,² for Tacitus is fond of giving a novel turn to stereotype and formulaic expressions.

Far more serious, in my judgment, are the objections that may be urged against *rationis*, the traditional text. To support it, modern editors are compelled to understand by *ratio* 'shrewd calculation, kluge Berechnung' which, we are told, passes by an easy transition into the meaning of 'economy, Sparsamkeit,' the signification demanded here. Now we may at once admit that *ratio*, a rather Protean word, does frequently come to mean 'shrewd calculation'; we may also grant, that in a man of Agricola's character such 'calculation' would under the circumstances have led him to practise economy, but *ratio* itself never has this connotation, and hence it does not constitute the antithesis to *abundantia* unquestionably intended by the author, particularly when we remember that the self-same *ratio*, in the case of innumerable Roman praetors, resulted in most lavish extravagance at the public games, by which means they hoped to acquire popularity. *Lipsius*, evidently feeling the difficulty just pointed out, read *moderationis* for '*medio rationis*.'³ A far more plausible correction, and equally easy, is to write '*medio moderationis atque abundantiae*,' 'mode' being omitted as an alleged dittography of '*medio*' (*mdo*). As for the meaning here assigned to *moderatio*, cp. *Cic. de Off.* I. 27 ext.: *ut in eo moderatio et temperantia appareat cum specie quadam liberali (= longe a luxuria)*, *Tac. Ann.* III. 54, 13: *cur olim parsimonia poiebat? quia sibi quisque moderabatur.*

Agr. 8, 2: *placidius (sc. praeerat) quam feroci provincia dignum est.*

Acidalius proposed *esset*. This has justly

been rejected as unnecessary, but Tacitus very probably did not write *est* at all, for he invariably *omits* the copula after *dignum*, the passage in *H. I.* 15 *est tibi frater pari nobilitate, natu maior, dignus hac fortuna* constituting no exception, for obvious reasons.⁴

Agr. 9, 8: *ubi officio satisfactum, nullam ultra potestatis personam.*

All recent editors, so far as they do not resort to very arbitrary changes, read '*nulla ... persona*,' taking it as an ablative of quality or as a nominative, *erat* being understood in either case. They also assume that the accusative of the MSS. is due to the misinterpretation of '*ultra*' as a preposition. But plausible as this seems, I am inclined to believe with *Clemm*,⁵ that we have here but another instance of the ellipsis of *agere* so common in Tacitus, e.g. *Agr.* 19, 5 *nihil per libertos servosque publicae rei (sc. egit) H. I.* 84, 1 *Ann.* I. 43, 3 *IV.* 38, 18 *XIV.* 7, 11 and very similar *G.* 37, 10 *medio tam longi aevi spatio multa in vicem damna (sc. facta sunt)*. Equally bold ellipses in the smaller works are: *Agr.* 33, 2 *iamque agmina et armorum fulgores audientissimi cuiusque procursu (sc. aspiciabantur), G. 14, 14 materia munificentiae per bella et raptus (sc. paratur)*. If it be added, finally, that '*personam aliquam agere*' is a construction frequently used by Tacitus (e.g. *H. I.* 30, 4 *II.* 83, 2 *IV.* 2, 3 *Ann.* I. 4, 15 *XIII.* 14, 4. 46, 18. *XVI.* 28, 11), all valid objections to the MS. reading will be removed.

Agr. 11, 11: *eorum sacra deprehendas, superstitionum persuasionem, sermo, etc.*

Nipperdey, with that singular perversity and astonishing infelicity which distinguish all his critical contributions to the *minor* works of Tacitus, has boldly athetized the words '*superstitionum persuasionem*' as the gloss of a Christian scribe! Schoene cheerfully acquiesced. Others, such as *Roth*, *Peirlkamp*, *Peter*, *Andresen*, *Halm* retain the MSS. reading. Their explanations, however, are, if possible, more difficult than the traditional text, and *Maxa*,⁶ in his exhaustive discussion of this passage, has had no trouble in refuting them. *Wex*, *Kritz*, *Ulrichs*, *Tuecking*, *Draeger*, *Gantrelle*, *Joh. Müller* and *Maxa* himself, to mention only these, have accepted *persuasiones*, the

¹ See esp. *Maxa*, *Progr.* Radantz 1. (1885) pp. 44 ff.—These admirable discussions of the cruxes in the Agricola seem to have been unduly neglected. Their author unfortunately only lived to complete fifteen chapters, the last programme being published after his death in 1887.

² *H. IV.* 47, 6 *Ann.* XVI. 6, 7.

³ He gave to *duxit* the meaning of *putavit* and construed it with a genitive after the analogy of '*ratus*,' e.g. *Tac. Ann.* III. 20.

⁴ The same is true of '*indignus*' which takes the copula only in the following passage. *Ann.* I. 42, 16: *si . . . aspernaretur, tamen mirum et indignum erat*, where its insertion is also easily accounted for.

⁵ De brevilocutione Tacitea etc. p. 43 ff. Cp. also *Petzke*, *Dicendi genus Tacitum quatenus differat a Liviano*, *Diss. Königsberg* pp. 35 ff. (1888).

⁶ *L. c.* II. 21-26.

very easy emendation of *Glück*, the 's' having been accidentally omitted, owing to the 's' following, a notoriously common source of error. The plural of *persuasio* is also unobjectionable. It occurs e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 94, 30 and Plin. *N.H.* XXIX. 1, 8, 28 D. (not II. 8, 6 as cited by Maxa). The 'asyndeton bimembre,' as remarked above, is quite frequent in Tacitus, but an examination of all instances (Müller's list is not complete) reveals not a single example in which a predicate separates the two objects, as here, or a subject or object is placed between two predicates. The only word allowed to intervene in an 'asyndeton bimembre' is an attributive genitive or personal pronoun and even then *each* member is usually thus amplified, doubtless for the sake of stylistic libration. This being so, I have always felt that Tacitus wrote: 'eorum sacra deprehendas ac superstitionum persuasiones,' the graphical resemblance, not to say identity, between 'ac' and 'as,' the immediately preceding syllable, being responsible for the haplography. By these easy changes, we not only secure a perfectly intelligible text, not in need of far-fetched and improbable interpretations, but also a 'collocatio verborum,' supported by numerous analogies in Tacitus. Cf. e.g. *Agr.* 17 aut victoria complexus est aut bello 42 nec Agricola consilium deerat nec Domitiano exemplum *Dial.* 34 sive accusationem susceperat sive defensionem, and similarly *Agr.* 33 inventa Britannia et subacta *G.* 11 aut incohatur luna aut impletur *Dial.* 37 intulerit ictus et exceperit, to which passage I have collected still other instances (p. 352).¹

Agr. 12, 16: patiens frugum fecundum.

Patiens, when used absolutely, means (1) 'hard, firm, unyielding,' as e.g. *Prop.* I. 16, 29 saxo patientior *Ov.* Am. I. 15, 31 aratrum patiens or (2) 'patient, enduring,' e.g. Caes. B.C. III. 96 miserrimo et patientissimo exercitus Cic. de orat. II. 75, 305 patiens et lentus Lael. 25, 91 pro Lig. 8, 24 ad Quint. frat. I. 1, 14 ad fam. I. 8, 4 et saep. But in the signification required here 'tolerant of, productive of, yielding,' the only meaning in which Tacitus uses the word, it always takes the genitive. Cp. Lex. Tac. s.v. *patiens* and *impatiens*, esp. *G.* 5, 3 terra...satis ferax, frugiferarum arborum [im] patiens, pecorum fecunda.

Partly for the reason given, partly

prompted by the remarkable parallel passage just cited, some editors have inserted 'arborum' or 'pomorum' before *patiens*; Peter, to get rid of the 'asyndeton gradativum' reads 'pabuli fecundum,' with chiasmus, apparently forgetting that 'pabulum' is quite incompatible with 'tarde mitescunt,' immediately following.² Still others, as Kritz and Schoene, calmly delete *fecundum*, as a gloss, presumably of some chauvinistic scribe! Urlichs and Cornelissen join *patiens* with the preceding clause. The great majority of editors, however, solve the difficulty by simply placing the comma after *frugum*, assuming an 'asyndeton bimembre.' I should rest satisfied with this solution, which involves no change whatever, were it not for the following consideration. I know of no example where, of two asyndetic adjectives, only one of them has an attributive attached to it. Unless, therefore, we are willing to admit this solitary exception on the ground that 'frugum,' belonging, as it does, to both adjectives, was placed between them, a very common stylistic device of Tacitus, I should prefer to read: *frugum patiens, fecundum*. Such accidental transpositions are extremely numerous in all MSS. The emendation is less bold than the insertion of 'arborum' or 'pomorum,' which are objectionable also on other grounds, and somehow better subserves the function for which the asyndeton is used in this particular passage.

Agr. 17, 2: magni, duces, egregii exercitus, minuta hostium spes et terrorem statim intulit Petilius Cerialis.

This passage violates Tacitean usage in asyndetic collocations, for whenever in an asyndetic enumeration, the last member contains a new thought or a more general idea or sums up, it is joined by *et* to the asyndetic group.³ Cf. *Agr.* 13 extr. domitae gentes, capti reges et monstratus fatibus Vespasianus *G.* 30, 5 duriora genti corpora, stricti artus, minax vultus (physical qualities) et maior animi vigor 44, 5 rotunda scuta, breves gladii et erga reges obsequium *H.* I. 36, 12 adorare vulgum, incere oscula et omnia serviliter pro dominatione IV. 1, 14 ubique lamenta, conclamationes et fortunae captae urbis *Ann.* I. 25, 6 murmur incertum, atrox clamor et repente quies. Consistency, therefore, demands 'et minuta hostium spes.' Curiously enough, in the parallel passage from the *Agricola* just cited, one MS. omits *et* before 'monstratus,' in the

¹ According to Maxa l.c. II. p. 24, the insertion of 'ac' or 'et' has long ago been suggested by Schömann, Greifswald Index Lect. 1859-60 p. 7, but this article has not been accessible to me. Andersen, by some curious error, attributed 'ac-persuasiones' to Glück.

² Maxa l.c. II. p. 33.

³ Cf. Jour. Phil. XII. pp. 454 ff. and my note to *Dial.* c. 37, 18 (p. 348).

present both A and B omitted it. I am also inclined to believe that Tacitus wrote: 'terrorem statim intulit,' the *et* being perhaps the very *et* which strayed away from the place, where we found it to be necessary, or else it is a mere dittography of the *es* preceding. The predicate, moreover, coming before its subject renders the omission of *et* very plausible, at least in Tacitus.

Agr. 17, 8: *et Cerialis quidem alterius successoris curam famamque obruisset: sustinuitque molem Julius Frontinus.*

So our two MSS. But modern editors have with singular unanimity abandoned this reading, the majority being content with bracketing *que*, while others suspect a lacuna, which each fills out in his own way. It does not seem to have been thought worth the while to enquire, whether the *que* may not after all be quite unobjectionable. Andresen—he reads 'sustinuit'—says 'in ipsa verbi collocatione inest gravissima vis adversativa.' This would be an excellent explanation but for the circumstance that the MSS. clearly exhibit *sustinuitque*. Now it can easily be shown that *que* very often has a 'vis adversativa.' If so, the proposed changes will not be correcting a corrupt reading but the author himself. This is, however, hardly the function of the critic. Moreover, I can discover no motive for the scribes, who must all have been ignorant of the stylistic observations collected in Andresen's 'De verborum apud Tacitum collocatione,' to insert a *que* on mere caprice, not to mention the fact that no one has as yet succeeded in proving the existence of a single, deliberate interpolation in the *Agricola*, for such the *que* would be, and in making this statement, I do not overlook the attempts made in that direction by Wex, Peerlkamp, Ritter, Nipperdey, Cornelissen and Schoene. The following selected list of examples at my disposal of *que* = *sed* will, I hope, suffice to vindicate the reading of our MSS.

Cic. de Sen. 20, 77 iam sensus moriendi aliquis esse potest, isque ad exiguum tempus *Vell.* Pat. II. 11 C. Marius hirtus atque horridus, vitaeque sanctus II. 24 Sulla neque...nec quod erat in manibus omisit, existimavitque ante frangendum hostem and *Tac.* *Agr.* 14, 10 Didium Veranius excepit isque intra annum extinctus est H. I. 50, 22 et ambigua de Vespasiano fama (sc. erat) solusque omnium...in melius mutatus est Ann. III. 18, 12 addiderat...Tiberio et Augustae...grates omiseratque Claudii mentionem 42, 4 pellicere alam equitum...ut...bellum inciperet; paucique equitum corrupti

(sc. sunt) XIII. 10, 3 Caesar effigiem Domitio...petivit a senatu; sibi que statuas...prohibuit XVI. 19, 14 obsignata misit Neroni fregitque anulum. To these and other exx. given in *Lex. Tac.* s.v. *que* (p. 1282^b 1283^a), we should perhaps add Ann. III. 35, 6 IV. 4 ext. 29 ext. XI. 35, 9 XII. 14, 10.

Agr. 24, 1: Quinto expeditionum anno *nave prima* transgressus ignotas ad id tempus gentes.

A much molested passage, as may be seen from the following selection of conjectures: 'navi in proxima, aestate prima, gnave prima (neut. plur.), vere primo, marituma, nova perinde,' and, to cap the climax, 'in Clotae proxima,' to which glaringly improbable conjecture Andresen remarks 'sic optime Nipperdey' and straightway receives it into his text!¹ The few who defend the reading of the MSS. usually interpret the phrase as 'the first vessel sent out at the opening of navigation in the spring,' and, indeed, if *nave prima* could bear no other signification we should certainly have to regard the passage as corrupt. All difficulty will, however, be removed, if we read *primum* (prim.) which scarcely involves any change, but even this is not necessary, for I fail to see why we should not recognise in *prima* simply another example of the well-known use of the adjective for the adverb, a suggestion which I subsequently discovered had long ago been made by *Walch* (p. 303). To the illustrations given by him, *Ag.* 19 *primam* (*primum* B *Peter*) domum suam coercuit Ann. XIV. 10 eum...prima Centurionum adulatio ad spem firmavit, add *G.* 43, 23 *primi* in omnibus proeliis, oculi vincuntur II. II. 96, 1 *prima* Vitellio tertiae legionis defectio nuntiatur Ann. XII. 19, 6 *magnarum nationum regibus primam* ex similitudine fortunae...amicitiam esse. Tacitus, it must be admitted, generally places the adjective *before* its noun, unless rhetorical reasons decree otherwise, but among the conspicuous exceptions to this practice, Andresen himself, in the article cited above (p. 20), mentions *primus*.

Agr. 28, 6: *tris liburnicas adactis per vim gubernatoribus ascendere et uno remigante, suspectis duobus eoque interfectis... amissis per inscitiam (sc. gubernandi) navibus.*

¹ The absurdity of this violent change will become the more manifest, when the conviction has gained ground, as I am confident it will, that the whole chapter is unintelligible except on the presumption of an expedition to Ireland. Cf. *W. Pfitzner*, Progr. Neustrelitz 1893 pp. 34 and *Fleckeisen's Jahrb.* vol. 153 pp. 560—564.

It has long been recognised that the sense is incomplete and that we require the additional idea of 'back' or 'returning,' for those who, like Peter, take *remigante* = gubernante are sufficiently refuted by the clause 'amissis—navibus,' even supposing that *remigare* could have the meaning which they assign to it. Among the many remedies suggested, such as: 'remigerante; regente; remeante; remorante; refugo uno ante; refugiente; reneante; renatante; velificante; *renavigante*, only the last has met with anything like general acceptance, and yet I have always felt certain that Tacitus did not write it. Not because it does not satisfy the evident meaning of the context, for it does, but simply because it would constitute, so far as I have been able to discover, a unique instance of the corruption of a perfectly intelligible and commonplace expression into another word which is as suitable and fitting as the author in this particular case could possibly have chosen. There is, therefore, a very strong presumption that *remigante* is perfectly sound, but if so, the evident corruption now existing must lurk elsewhere. I am convinced that the original is restored by reading: 'uno RETRO *remigante*,' the *retro* easily falling out, because of the *re* following, a species of error occurring frequently in the best MSS.

Agr. 34, 12: novissimae res et extremo metu corpora defixere *aciem* in his vestigiis.

'Corpora' and '*aciem*' cannot both be right. The majority of critics retain the latter, changing the text so as to read: 'res et extremus metus torpore,' 'res et extremo metu torpor,' or, by a more radical change 'novissimi nimirum et extremo metu torpidi (torpidam)' while still others abandon emendation and practically rewrite the passage. Now *Wex* (p. 107 ff.) has long since shown, but apparently to no purpose, that '*aciem defixere*' is in the sense of 'rivetting the line of battle' is not idiomatic Latin. And even if it were, the stubborn resistance therein implied would hardly serve as a source of encouragement for a Roman army. Then again, it is not likely that Agricola, who contemptuously speaks of his opponents as a band of cowards and runaways who 'non restiterunt sed deprehensi sunt,' would have dignified their ranks by the term '*acies*.' Nor can '*aciem defixere*' here have the meaning, which it has often enough elsewhere, of 'fixing one's steady gaze upon a thing,' for this among the ancients, curious as it may seem to us, was not the outcome of 'extremus metus,' but of

indomitable courage. Cf. e.g. *Hor.* C. I 3, 18 qui siccis oculis monstra natantia, qui vidit mare turgidum and Postgate's note to Prop. II. 27, 7. If *aciem* must therefore, be considered out of place, probably due to a gloss on *corpora*, this latter must not be molested, and all that is required to restore the passage is to read 'extremus metus,' the 's' being omitted, because of the similarity of the following letter, which error in turn very naturally drew along with it the change of 'extremus' to 'extremo.' This emendation seems to me in every way more methodical than to delete 'et' with *Wex* and others; in fact the presence of the conjunction clearly points to a nominative following. I, therefore, write: 'novissimae res et extremus metus corpora defixere in his vestigiis.'¹ This reading, it may be remarked in passing, is also more in conformity with the laws of prose rhythm which Tacitus, closely following Cicero's Orator and Quintilian, has imposed upon himself, an observation which I hope to establish in detail elsewhere, for the 'numerus Taciteus' seems not hitherto to have been made a subject of investigation.

Agr. 38, 16: ipse peditem atque equites . . . in hibernis locavit,

Read: 'pedites atque equites' or 'peditem atque equitem,' for, fond as Tacitus admittedly is of inconcinnity of collocation, he never, in all the 30 instances of 'pedes' and 'eques' found in his writings, varies the number, except when these words occur in adversative clauses or when in different syntactical relation. When closely joined by a copulative conjunction, they occur either both in the collective singular (7 times) or both in the plural (14 times).

Agr. 43, 13: speciem tamen doloris animo vultuque prae se tulit.

That *animo* cannot well be correct is all but universally conceded,² but the emendations hitherto suggested possess no intrinsic probability, e.g. 'mimo, amictu, ore, sermone' and this is preeminently true of the generally accepted correction of *Ernesti*, who writes *habitu* for *animo*, chiefly, it would seem, because 'habitus' and 'vultus' are not infrequently combined. I have not the slightest doubt that Tacitus wrote: 'speciem doloris animi vultu prae se tulit.' The change is simplicity itself, for the *que* was naturally added when 'animi' had become 'animo,'

¹ This note had long been written, when I found that *Constans*, Rev. de phil. XXI. p. 29 had advocated the same reading, but he gives no grounds for his opinion.

² Cf. esp. *Wachtlin*, Phil. XXVI. p. 154.

though it is also quite possible that *que* is nothing more than a dittography of *pr* (*prae*). With the phrase, cp. *Cic.* in *Verr.* I 8,21 *cupiebam animi dolorem vultu tegere*, pro *Sest.* 41,88 *dolorem animi* and especially the remarkable parallel in *Curt.* VI 9,1 (32) *vultu praeferebat dolorem animi*.

Agr. 44, 11 ff.: *Et ipse quidem, quamquam medio in spatio integrae aetatis ereptus, quantum ad gloriam, longissimum aevum peregit: Quippe et vera bona quae in virtutibus sita sunt et consulari ac triumphalibus ornamentis praedito, quid aliud adstruere fortuna poterat? Opibus nimis non gaudebat: speciosae non contigerant filia atque uxore superstitibus: Potest videri etiam beatus, incolumi dignitate, florente fama, salvis affinitatibus et amicitiiis futura effugisse.*

This is the reading of our two MSS., but Tacitus cannot have written the passage as it stands. One difficulty has, indeed, long been noticed and many attempts have been made to do away with it, but all were necessarily doomed to failure for reasons which will appear later. Another difficulty, though no less perplexing, has never been felt. I turn to the latter first.

In the first place, I ask, what is the antecedent of 'quippe'?¹ The answer probably would be '*quantum ad gloriam*,' but that is impossible for several reasons. To begin with, this phrase is only thrown in as parenthesis. A second far more serious objection is, that the constituent elements which secured such *gloria*² to Agricola are enumerated in the very clause introduced by way of contrast to something that preceded, and significantly joined with '*vera bona*' by '*et...et*.' Again, no *bona*, to which the *vera bona* might be opposed, had been previously mentioned. But if so, then both *quippe* and *vera bona* hang completely in the air, *gloriam* being out of the question, as involving no antithesis. Now this difficulty is removed, if we suppose that the archetypum had: *peregit. Opibus nimis non gaudebat speciosae non contigerant. Quippe et vera bona etc.* The eye of the copyist passed from OPB to QPP, but noticing his oversight too late for immediate correction, he inserted the omitted *κῶλον*, when he reached the presumable end

¹ Synonymous, as often in Tacitus, with *enim*, which could not have been used here for obvious reasons.

² It may be noted in passing that the Stoics, whose doctrines are clearly here hinted at, probably did not reckon 'glory' as among the *mala* or *ἀδύφωνα*, for, as Cicero facetiously remarked (pro *Arch.* 11,26), they never fail to put their names to their treatises 'de gloria continentenda.'

of the sentence at '*poterat*.' With this emendation, all the difficulty disappears: 'He did not take delight in excessive riches and, as a matter of fact, resplendent or showy (*speciosus* is an extremely strong word) wealth did not fall to his lot, but, of course, that did not sour a man of Agricola's nature (quippe = enim, with the usual ellipsis to be supplied in thought), for both the true blessings which consist in virtue and the highest political honours had been his etc.'

This is good Stoic doctrine. The wise and, therefore, virtuous man, is both *dives* and *rex*, even without actually possessing material wealth or royal power.

Having thus restored what, I feel convinced, every unprejudiced reader will regard as the meaning of the author, I proceed to discuss the other crux referred to above. It turns upon the words '*filia...superstitibus*,' and I confess to having been not a little surprised to find, that the very transposition which had been advocated on internal grounds alone and quite independent of any bearing it might have upon the present problem, also furnished the key to its solution.

The MSS., it must be observed, make no stop till *potest*, joining *filia atque uxore superstitibus* closely with *contigerant*, a collocation quite impossible. *Wez* tried to get over the difficulty by reading '*speciosae contigerant filiae atque uxori superstitibus*.' As this had absolutely nothing in its favour, editors were driven nolentes volentes, to take the ablative absolute with the '*potest*' clause, but this involved them in other difficulties, from which they endeavoured to extricate themselves in various ways.

Doederlein and *Urlichs* rightly felt that if this clause is to go with what follows, it ought not to be separated from the other ablatives and, accordingly, the former boldly placed it after *fama*, the latter after *amicitiis*, thus securing an admirable climax; but neither took the trouble to explain the curious dislocation, and their suggestions in consequence were rejected. Another editor, thereupon, in his perplexity maintained that the separation of these ablatives was due to the fact that the '*filia etc.*' clause was an ablative of *cause*, explaining *beatus*, while the others were ablatives of *quality*; forgetting, of course, that this alleged separation is not confirmed by the MSS. But the climax is reached by *Peter* who, in all seriousness, asserts that we have here nothing more than a harsh Tacitean ellipsis, the sentence in full being: '*filia...superstitibus, potest...beatus<excessisse>...effugiens*!' This ab-

surdity is not only accepted by *Andresen*, but the author of the 'De verborum apud Tacitum collocatione' adds that the words 'filia...superstitibus' are placed at the beginning and separated from their fellows, 'quod illis maiorem tribuebat gravitatem!'

But the ablative absolute under discussion cannot be taken with the 'potest' clause under any circumstances, and that chiefly for two reasons, not to lay too much stress upon the testimony of MSS. in matters of punctuation. One of these had long ago been pointed out by *Selling* and *Wex*, but their argument has been hitherto wholly ignored. It is the simple observation, that Tacitus could never have said that Agricola, while still *living*, was happy, because his child and wife *survived* him. We expect at least 'etiam tum vivis.' 'Nam superstites is demum habet qui mortuus est, non qui moriturus' (*Wex* p. 98). Beside, asked *Selling*, would Agricola have been less happy in escaping the evil days to come, if his wife and child had not survived?

In the second place, the very position of *potest*, separated by a considerable interval from its verb *effugisse* at the end of the sentence, is a clear proof, that it was intended to open the sentence, for this is one of the most characteristic features of the 'collocatio verborum Tacitea.' Out of the *thirty* instances, given in the *Lex. Tac.*, s.v. *possum* (p. 1141), fifteen of which *Andresen* himself enumerates l.c. p. 2, it will be sufficient to cite: *Agr. 42 posse etiam sub malis principibus bonos viros esse.*

But if 'filia...superstitibus' can neither be joined to *contigerant* nor with *potest*, what becomes of it? The transposition above advocated disposes of this dilemma. In the original text, the above clause followed *poterat*, where it fits in most admirably, the ablative absolute at the end of a 'clausula' being, moreover, of very frequent occurrence in Tacitus, and particularly so in the *Agricola*. Cp. *Dial. 1, 19 G. 28, 9. 41, 8. 46, 11 and Agr. 2, 12. 7, 8. 9, 25. 14, 4. 15, 12. 22, 2. 23, 6. 30, 5.*

We come to the last point to be discussed in this passage, for hitherto the *non* before 'contigerant' has been tacitly accepted as given by both MSS., although modern editors delete it, chiefly on the basis of a marginal note in A.¹ But these glosses have no MS. authority whatsoever; they are simply the conjectures of Pomponius Laetus and very poor ones at that. In the passage before us,

his critical contribution has been particularly unfortunate, for we have the very strongest reasons for the retention of the *negative*.

In the first place, the deletion of *non* would make Tacitus flatly contradict *Cass. Dio LXVI, 20*, the one other extant writer to mention Agricola at all and from *independent* sources at that. Now making all due allowance for overstatement or exaggerated expression, there can be no doubt that Dio was well informed, when he said l.c. δ δὲ Ἀγρικώλας ἐν τῇ ἀτιμίᾳ τὸ λοιπὸν τοῦ βίου καὶ ἐν δειλίᾳ...ἔζησεν, and yet *Peelkamp* does not shrink from emending the Greek text to bring it into harmony with a purely conjectural reading in the Latin!

But apart from the testimony of the MSS. and Cassius Dio, there are also strong *internal* grounds in favour of *non*. For everything that we gather from the biography itself concerning Agricola's personal estate proves him not to have had 'opes *speciosas*.' Thus, we learn that he lost his patrimony²; that Caligula confiscated the fortune of Agricola's father after his execution is also highly probable.³

Finally Tacitus' repeated references to his scrupulous honesty, his refusal to connive at rascality or share in the time-honoured practice of extortion, his conduct as praetor (c. 6) and the very mention of his not receiving the 'salarium proconsulare'—all point to the fact that Agricola was *not* a very wealthy man. Last, but not least, it is very difficult to believe that Tacitus could ever have made the gratuitous and vapid remark which the editors attribute to him: 'Excessive riches had no charms for him, but such fell to his lot.' How appropriate and significant on the other hand, in a 'liber honori soceri mei destinatus' the statement becomes, if we retain the *non* of the MSS., will be clear from the paraphrase given above. The whole passage, as emended, will, therefore, read thus:

'Ipse quidem...peregit. Opibus nimis *non* gaudebat, *speciosae non contigerant*. Quippe et vera bona...et consulari...praedito, quid aliud adstruere fortuna poterat, filia atque uxore superstitibus? Potest videri etiam beatus...effugisse.

Agr. 45, 5: una adhuc victoria Carus Metius censebatur et intra Albanam arcein sententia Messalini strepebat et Massa Baebius iam tum reus erat.

Iam is omitted in B and hence the great

² Cp. 7 magnam patrimonii partem diripuit (sc. classis Othoniana).

³ Cp. 4 and *Urticks*, De vita et honoribus Agricolae p. 8.

¹ Cf. *Heller*, Philol. LI. pp. 340 ff., retains the *non*, but his treatment does not touch the points at issue.

majority of editors felt justified in bracketing the word, *Gronovius* suggesting *etiam* as an alternative, as if these changes did away with the difficulty, for Tacitus in any case is made to interrupt his enumeration of the evils, which Agricola happily did not live to see, by an incident which could not but have been a cause for rejoicing and gratification; for this notorious informer had been, as early as the days of Claudius, to use Tacitus' own words in H. IV. 50: *optimo cuique exitiosus et inter causas malorum quae mox tulimus, saepius rediturus.* The inconsistency here pointed out is easily disposed of by reading *nondum* for 'iam tum.' Just as *Metius* and *Messalinus* had not yet revealed all the cruelty and rascality of which they were capable, so *Baebius Massa* seems to have kept his well-known evil propensities in check for a while; at the present time he had not yet committed any misdeeds of sufficient enormity to result in an impeachment. But this occurred, as we happen to know, in the year of Agricola's death and resulted in his conviction. Agricola was, therefore, fortunate in not witnessing the reappearance of

this rascal, particularly as his condemnation seems not materially to have weakened his power ('saepius rediturus').

Agr. 46, 7: *admiratione te potius et immortalibus laudibus et, si natura suppeditet, similitudine colamus.*

Nearly all editors have followed *Muretus* in reading *colamus* for *decoramus* of the MSS. 'Decoramus' (Ursinus) may possibly be defended in view of the well-known line from Ennius 'nemo me lacrimis decorat.' But if *colamus* is to be substituted as being somehow more suitable to the simple pathos of this wonderful epilogue, we should at least read: 'admiratione potius...te colamus.' Not only does *te* thus receive its proper emphasis by position, making a 'dichoreic' clausula, but the *decoramus*, if it be corrupt, is thus most plausibly accounted for, J. Müller's explanation that *de* was due to the last syllable of an abbreviated 'similitudine' (similitude) being impossible, because that word is itself but an emendation of *Grotius*, the MSS. having 'militum' or 'multum.'

ALFRED GUDEMAN.

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 1897.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(Continued from p. 237.)

VIII. THE AGESILAUS.

SINCE Valckenaer first expressed an opinion that the *Agesilaus* was not the work of Xenophon, its authenticity has been much discussed. Perhaps the chief argument on one side has been the style. Critics have said with some reason that in places it reminded them less of X. than of Isocrates. But, just as with the two *Constitutions*, no one that I know of has gone carefully enough through the vocabulary and syntax of the book, comparing them with what we know of X.'s usual way of writing. They have indeed received much less attention than the language of the *Constitutions*, and a few detached remarks are all that seem to have been made on the subject. I will endeavour to examine them somewhat more systematically, though of course not exhaustively.

For our purpose it will be well to divide the book into three parts. The first two chapters are largely, though not entirely, made up of passages taken from the *Hellenics* or at least agreeing more or less *verbatim*

with passages in the *Hellenics*; and, so far as this agreement goes, the style, vocabulary, etc. cannot be used as an argument. These two chapters, therefore, which are yet highly deserving of our attention, I will reserve to the end, taking first chapters 3-10, and then separately chapter 11, the authenticity of which has been more particularly doubted.

In chapters 3-10 we find again a few of the words we have already noticed as Xenophontean. Ὡς=ὥστε with indicative occurs in 3, 2 (οὕτως ἐσέβητο...ὥς...ἐνόμιζον); ἐνθα 'where' occurs 5, 7: 6, 2: 10, 1; τέκνα 3, 3; πάμπαν 5, 3; μέιον 6, 3 and μειοεκτείν 4, 5: 7, 2; εὐφροσύνη 9, 4. But there are very many more of the same kind to be added. I will take the chapters *seriatim*. Λάφυρα is a tragic word unknown to Attic prose, but X. uses it in *Hell.* 5, 1, 24, and either λάφυρα πολεῖν or λαφυροπολεῖν in *Anab.* 6, 6, 38: it is used here in 4, 6. In the words ὅστις δ' ἡρέτο καὶ σὺν τῷ γενναίῳ μειοεκτεῖν ἢ σὺν τῷ ἀδίκῳ πλέον ἔχειν (4, 5) we have language doubly characteristic of X., for it is his way not only to use σὺν (so

σὺν Ἀγροσίλῳ in 3, 4) where most prose writers use *μετά*, but to combine it with certain substantives or quasi-substantives so as to produce a sort of adverbial expression. In poetry we find *σὺν δίκῃ*, etc.: in prose it is X. who gives us such phrases as *σὺν τῷ καλῷ* (*Cyr.* 8, 1, 32): *σὺν τῷ δίκαιῳ καὶ καλῷ* (*Anab.* 2, 6, 18): *οὐδαμῶς σὺν τῇ βίᾳ ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον σὺν τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ* (*Cyr.* 8, 7, 13): *σὺν τῷ σῷ ἀγαθῷ* (*ib.* 3, 1, 15): *σὺν κραυγῇ, σὺν γέλωτι*, etc. *Πῇ* (4, 3 *πῇ ἂν τις αὐτὸν εἰκότως αἰτιάσται*) is common in X. and Plato, very little used I think by the orators. Demosthenes has it once only, and that in almost his earliest speech (29, 1). *Θοίνῃ* is another word not used, as far as we can tell, in ordinary Attic, though Plato has it eight or ten times. It occurs in *Cyr.* 4, 2, 39 and here in 5, 1: also *θονάζω* in 8, 7 (*θονατικός* *Oec.* 9, 7). *Μόχθος* and *μοχθεῖν* do not occur at all in the orators. Aristophanes uses the verb three or four times in the *Plutus* only, and always in anapaests or trochaics; the substantive in some burlesque anapaests in *Thesm.* 780. The words do not seem to be used at all by Plato. On the other hand X. uses the noun twice in the *Symposium* and the verb half a dozen times in various places. The verb occurs here in 5, 3. *Ἀνὰ κράτος* is another Xn. expression not shared by Plato, who uses the more Attic *κατὰ κράτος*: it occurs here in 5, 4: 8, 3. X. often uses *ἀντίος* where more Attic writers use *ἐναντίος*: so here in 5, 7 we have *ἀντία τῆς Ἑλλάδος = ἐναντίον τῆς Ἑλλάδος*. *Ἀγάλλεσθαι* is unknown to Aristophanes and the orators: Thucydides has it half a dozen times, Plato once or twice, X. in at least a dozen places. It is used here three times (5, 3: 9, 1 and 4).

The use of *θυμῷ* 'with spirit' as in *θυμῷ μάχεσθαι* (6, 2) may be found once or twice in Thucydides and in *Cyr.* 4, 2, 21 *ἴωμεν ῥώμῃ καὶ θυμῷ ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους*, but it must be very uncommon. The frequent use of *θυμῷ = ὀργῇ*, as in *τὰ θυμῷ πραχθέντα*, in the ninth book of Plato's *Laws* is similar, but not quite identical. *Παρέχειν*, used as in 6, 4 *τοὺς δὲ στρατιώτας ἅμα πειθομένους καὶ φιλοῦντας αὐτὸν παρέχειν*, where it simply means 'make so and so,' 'put into a certain condition,' is very characteristic of X. (see the index in Holden's *Oeconomicus*), and the way in which it is followed by *εἶχε* in the next sentence, *τοὺς γε μὴν πολεμίους εἶχε ψέγειν μὲν οὐ δυναμένους κ.τ.λ.*, corresponds curiously to a passage in *Oec.* 21, 4-5. On *ὅπου τάχος δέοι* (6, 5) we may remark that X. always uses *τάχος*, never *ταχυτής*, and on *λήθων* in the same §. that *λήθω* as a by-form

of *λανθάνω* is found in a few passages (*Oec.* 7, 31: *Symp.* 4, 48) of X. alone among Attic prose writers. The phrase *νυκτὶ ὅσαπερ ἡμέρα χρῆσθαι*, which on *R.L.* 5, 7 we saw to be Xn., occurs again here in 6, 6. With regard to 6, 7 *συντεταγμένον οὕτως...ὥς ἂν ἐπικουρεῖν μάλιστα ἑαυτῷ δύναιτο* see the remarks on *ὥς ἂν* in Goodwin *M. and T.* App. 4, 1 (b): *ἐπικουρῶ* we saw on *R.L.* 2, 6 to be Xn. *Ἀτρεμής* and kindred words occur very seldom in Attic prose, though they are found. X. has *ἀτρεμής ὄμμα* in *Symp.* 8, 3: *ἀτρεμία* *Cyr.* 6, 3, 13. *Ἀτρεμης* occurs a few times in the doubtful *Cynegeticus*. Here we have *τὸ ἀτρεμής* in 6, 7. *Ῥώμῃ* used (6, 8) of courage may be compared with *Hell.* 7, 5, 23 where *ῥώμῃ* is opposed to *ἀθυμία*. *ᾠφέλημα* is a word of the poets, not to be found in orators or Plato, but we have it in *Iliero* 10, 3 and here in 7, 2. *Ἡρεμεῖν*, not in Thucydides, comedy, or orators, but Platonic, is used three or four times by X. and here in 7, 3. *Δωρεῖσθαι* (7, 7) is a favourite word with X. and Plato, but hardly used in comedy or oratory. On the exceptional use of *ὥς* in an 'object sentence' (7, 7 *ἐπεμελήθη ὅπως... ἢ ὅπως... ἢ ὥς κ.τ.λ.*) see Goodwin *u. s.* p. 402. *Φιλόστοργος* (8, 1) and *μεγαλγοργεῖν* (8, 2) can be paralleled in the same and kindred forms from X., but hardly from any other good prose writer. With *μεγαλογνωμοσύνη* (8, 3) and *μεγαλογνώμων* (9, 6) cf. *μεγαλογνώμων* in *Oec.* 21, 8: the word is very rare. *Τεχνᾶσθαι* (9, 3) is scarcely used by the orators, Plato, or comedy (see, however, *Ar. Vesp.* 176), but occasionally by X. *Μαστεύω* (9, 3) = *ζητῶ* is a word characteristic of X., not used in pure prose. In 9, 3 we have also *κοιμᾶσθαι*, equally poetic and equally Xn. *Τέρπειν*, a word avoided by the orators but used two or three times, as also is *τερπνός*, by X., will be found in 9, 4. The use of *ἀνά* in 9, 7 *ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν* is not found, I fancy, in the best Attic prose, but there are many examples of it in X. *Ἀλκή* (10, 1) is used three or four times by X., who is also fond of *ἀλκιμος*: it occurs now and then in Thucydides, not in oratory, comedy, or even Plato. In 10, 4 we have *μήκιστος*, not found in pure prose but used *Cyr.* 4, 5, 28: we have seen before that X. also uses *μάσσων*.

The use of particles in these chapters is, as far as I can judge, quite Xn., though Roquette (*De X. Vita* p. 40) lays stress on the disproportionate use of *τοιγαροῦν* in *Ages.* (five times out of a total of nineteen), and though I do not notice a *καὶ-δέ* anywhere. The writer, too, pays no more attention than X. to the occurrence of hiatus.

Chapter 11 is certainly, in style, more full

of antitheses and other Isocratean turns of expression than we are accustomed to find in X. It is therefore a matter of particular interest to see whether the vocabulary is Xn. or no. I find in the first sentence his characteristic *ὡς* final and in the concluding sentence of the book his equally characteristic *ὥς* for *ὥστε*. *Πάμπαν* occurs again 11, 4: *μήκιστον* again 11, 15. The above-mentioned use of *σύν* is illustrated in 11, 11 by *τῷ μεγαλόφρονι οὐ σὺν ὑβρεὶ ἀλλὰ σὺν γνώμῃ ἐχρήτο*. 'Αρεστός (11, 5) used once by Lysias alone of the orators (Isocrates has *δυσάρεστος* twice), is rather a favourite word with X. The form *στερίσκω* (11, 5) is used once or twice by X., once apparently by Plato, more often by Thucydides, hardly by orators or comic poets. *Διαπονεῖν, εἶσθαι* (11, 7) are often found in X. and Plato, not often elsewhere. Characteristic of them both is also the extended use of *ἐρᾶν* as in 11, 9 *δόξης οὐδεμίας ἤρα*: cf. 3, 1. 'Αμυνοῦν (11, 12) is a poetical word (occurring, as does *ἀμυρός*, as a matter-of-fact *vocabulum artis* in the doubtful *Cynegeticus*) that does not surprise us in X. 'Αγήρατος (11, 14) is found in *Cyr.* 8, 7, 22: *Mem.* 4, 3, 13. We have had occasion before, in speaking of the *R.L.*, to observe that *μεγαλῆος, ῥαδιουργία* and *καλοκάγαθία* (11, 6 and 16) were favourite words with X. I think the same may be said of *εκπονεῖν* (11, 9) and of *διαγίγνεσθαι* with a participle (11, 16). Lastly we may notice as before the Xn. use of *ἀνά* in *ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν* (11, 16), and the Xn. *ἀμφί* (11, 11) for the more Attic *περί*. In the use of particles there seems to be nothing noticeable about this chapter, unless it be the somewhat clumsy frequency of *γε μήν*. Hiatus occurs very little in the earlier part, more often in the later. Thus we find *τῷ μὲν δικαίῳ ἀρκεῖν ἡγοούμενος τὸ εἶναι τὰλλότρια* (8): *τὸ εὐχαρί οὐ σκώμμασιν, τῷ μεγαλόφρονι οὐ σὺν ὑβρεὶ ἀλλὰ σὺν γνώμῃ ἐχρήτο* (11): *τῇ πατριδι ὠφέλιμος* and *τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρετῆς* (16). These things are worth noticing, because a *scriptor in schola quadam Isocrateus eruditus* and producing *ex Isocrateis officina profectas sententias* (Hartman in *Analecta Xenophontea*) was comparatively unlikely to let them pass.

I turn back now to the narrative part of the book, the first two chapters, which go over the same ground as portions of the *Hellenics* and have whole passages in common with it. I shall ignore such words as are found in the corresponding passages of the *Hellenics* and notice some which belong to the *Agésilais* only.

X., like Plato, makes much freer use of

ἐγχειρεῖν as an equivalent for *ἐπιχειρεῖν* than the orators do. We find in 1, 1 *ὅμως δ' ἐγχειρητέον*. *Μείων* is used several times (1, 1 and 13: 2, 1, etc.). The aorist *ὤρέχθην* is quoted from no prose writer but X. (*Mem.* 1, 2, 16: *Symp.* 8, 35), for in Isocr. *Ep.* 6, 9 *ὀρεγνῆθηναι* seems the better reading (Blass): we have it here in 1, 4. In the same section and again in 1, 26: 2, 7 we have the double *τε* (= *τε—καί*), rare in prose but sometimes used by X. [We have three instances in these chapters (1, 8, perhaps not certain: 2, 6 and 31) of a single *τε* used to attach a sentence or clause to something preceding: this is also used by X., but it occurs now and then in almost every writer.] 'Επίζω (1, 5) is a poetical word used by Plato and once or twice by X. The temporal use of *ἐπεὶ*, which we noticed in *R.L.* as characteristic of X. and Thucydides, occurs in 1, 5 and many other passages of these two narrative chapters. *Κατάδηλος* (1, 6) is used occasionally by X. and Plato, apparently only once or twice in an orator (Isocrates). *Πρόσθεν* we saw before to be very common in X. in place of the more ordinary Attic *ἐμπροσθεν*: it occurs here (1, 8, etc.) some half-dozen times. In 1, 18 see as to *λαφυροπωλεῖν* the remark above on *λάφυρα* in 4, 6, and notice that *προτελεῖν* is found *Anab.* 7, 7, 25: *Vect.* 3, 9, probably not elsewhere in the best Greek. The words in 1, 19 *ὅποτε αὐτόμολοι... χρήματα ἐθέλοιεν ὑφηγεῖσθαι* seem a clear case of *ἐθέλω=βούλομαι*, wish, not mere willingness. This is extremely rare in Attic prose, except in a few set phrases such as *ὁ ἐθέλων, ὃν ἂν ἐθέλῃ, ἂν ὁ θεὸς θέλῃ*. Whether a clear case can be found in X.'s undoubted writings, I do not know: but, like Plato, he is just such a writer as we should expect to use it occasionally. With the phrase *χρήματα ὑφηγεῖσθαι* may be compared *ἀγαθὰ ὑφηγεῖσθαι* in *Cyr.* 8, 7, 15. We have also in 1, 19 the first of four examples contained in these two chapters of X.'s special use of *ὡς* with 'object clauses' (see on 7, 7 above and cf. 1, 22: 2, 1 and 31 for the other examples): *ἐπεμέλετο ὡς διὰ τῶν φίλων ἰλίσκοιτο*. The poetical *ἀέναος* (1, 20) is found in *Cyr.* 4, 2, 44. 'Ὡς final occurs 1, 23: *ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ ἱππικὸν κατασκευαστέον εἶναι, ὡς μὴ δραπετεύοντα πολεμεῖν δέοι αὐτόν*. It is probably by an oversight that Goodwin ranks this as an 'object clause.' Another example occurs in 2, 8 *ὡς ἱκανοὶ εἰεν*. 'Ανὰ τὰ πεδιά (1, 23) and *ἀνὰ τὰ ὄρη* (2, 22) is the Xn. use noticed above. 'Αγαστός (1, 24) seems unique, but X. four times uses *ἀγαστός* and Plato is perhaps the only other good prose writer who employs it. 'Ρώμη is used of courage in 1, 28 as in 6, 8. 'Αποθύω

(1, 34) occurs twice in *Anab.*: ὁμόνομος (1, 37) in *Cyr.* 6, 4, 15: ἐθελούσιος (1, 38) several times in *Cyr.*

The first section of ch. 2 gives us στόλος, a historian's word very rare in the orators. In 2, 6 στρατεύμα... ἡγάγετο may be compared with *Anab.* 1, 10, 17: *Cyr.* 5, 4, 39. We find ὥς = ὥστε in 2, 7. For καὶ μέντοι (2, 9) cf. index to Holden's *Oeconomicus*. Μετὰ χείρας (2, 14) is an old or hardly Attic phrase (*Thuc.* 1, 138, 4: *Herod.* 7, 16) which causes us no surprise in X. Εἰπετής (2, 18 εἰπετός) though rare in the orators, is a favourite word with X. Πασσυδία (2, 19) or πασσυδί may be found in *Hell.* 4, 4, 9: *Thuc.* 8, 1, 1: and in poetry. Πῆ (2, 21) like πῆ (4, 3) belongs to X. and Plato, occurring very seldom in oratory or comedy. Κατακαίνω (2, 22 and 23) is a form used by poets and by X. The plural verb in σφάλματα ἐγένοντο (2, 23) is much more in X.'s way than in that of any other Attic prose writer. Σύν is used in 23 and 24, perhaps elsewhere. Τῷ παντί with πλέον and with κρατεῖν (2, 24) is also Xn., and εἰρωστος (*ibid.*) is a word used two or three times by him. Finally we may notice one of the rare points of syntax as distinguished from vocabulary in which X. seems to depart from the Attic rule. For the imperfect in 2, 28 ἄσμενος ἤκουσεν ὅτι μετεπέμπετο αὐτόν we should ordinarily have μεταπέμπεται or μεταπέμποιτο. It is known that X. often in *oratio obliqua* uses this imperfect to represent the present of the *recta*, and a list of many examples will be found in Joost's book on the *Anabasis*, p. 199. A less clear case occurs in 1, 38 ἐδύλωσαν ὅτι οὐ πλαστὴν τὴν φιλίαν παρείχοντο, where the imperfect may refer to a time previous to ἐδύλωσαν, and another quite clear one outside these two chapters in 3, 3 εἰδὼς ὅτι Φαρνάβαζος γῆμαι μὲν τὴν βασιλέως ἑπράττε θυγατέρα, τὴν δ' αὐτοῦ ἀνευ γάμου λαβεῖν ἐβούλετο... Ἀγρησιλῶ ἑαυτὸν... ἐνεχείρισε.

A few words in these chapters seem to deserve special mention. Three or four times where a passage in *Ages.* is practically the same as one in *Hell.*, we find a difference in one particular word, and the word used in *Ages.* is more markedly Xn. than that used in *Hell.* Thus *Hell.* 3, 4, 11 has ελάττωνα, while *Ages.* 1, 13 has μείονα: *Hell.* 3, 4, 15 has κατὰ τὰ πεδία, *Ages.* 1, 23 ἀνὰ τὰ πεδία (cf. the variation in *Eur. Med.* 509): *Hell.* *ibid.* προθύμως ζητοῖ, *Ages.* 1, 24 προθύμως μαστεύοι: *Hell.* 4, 3, 20 ἡ νίκη Ἀγρησιλάου ἐγγεγνήτο, *Ages.* 2, 13 ἡ νίκη σὺν Ἀγρησιλάῳ ἐγένετο: *Hell.* 4, 5, 1 βροσκήματα, *Ages.* 2, 18 κτήνη, a word used pretty often by X. but not in pure Attic prose: *Hell.* 4, 3, 6 τοὺς

περὶ αὐτόν, *Ages.* 2, 3 τοὺς ἀμφ' αὐτόν, and so in *Hell.* 4, 3, 17 as compared with *Ages.* 2, 11. In *Hell.* 3, 4, 15 μαστεύοι has been actually restored to the text by conjecture, founded on the *Ages.*, that ζητοῖ is only a gloss on the rarer word, and possibly it may be thought that similar changes should be made elsewhere. But in any case it is undeniable that in these instances—and there may be more of them—the more characteristic Xn. expression appears in the *Agesilaus*. A somewhat similar, yet not the same, occurrence may be observed in 2, 13-14. There are various details added here, to which nothing in *Hell.* exactly corresponds, and the sentences peculiar to *Ages.* contain the very Xn. words ἔστε = ἔως and ἔθα = οὐ or ἵνα. They contain also κολεός, which seems to occur in no prose writer but X., and χαμαί, which is very rare out of poetry but used *Hell.* 4, 1, 30.

Now that we have gone through the *Agesilaus* and ascertained what a large number of expressions it has throughout which belong distinctly to the idiom of X., it will be proper to see what evidence, if any, of a like nature can be adduced on the other side. We shall think very little of occasional ἅπαξ ἐρημένα in the way of adjectives and even of substantives and verbs, unless there is some special reason for doing so, because the various works of one author constantly exhibit this small diversity. There is no work of X., as there is no book of Thucydides and I daresay few dialogues of Plato, in which noticeable words do not occur that are not elsewhere used by the author. Such adjectives therefore as διδάσκατος (1, 4), φρονηματίας (1, 24), πλαστός (1, 38), ἀνώχυρος (6, 6), πολυέραστος and πολυεπαίνετος (6, 8), μέγανυχος (8, 1) and ὑπέρανυχος (11, 11), κρυψίνους (11, 5), εὐπαράπειστος (11, 12), μνήμων (11, 13), and γηραιός (11, 15) will not trouble us at all, especially as some of them, like so many of X.'s words, are known to us in the poets. Γεννικός (5, 4) is a doubtful emendation. There are two or three words which only occur in the disputed *Apologia*, and which cannot therefore be called certainly Xn.: εὐπάθεια 9, 3 and 11, 9: κακόδοξος 4, 1 (the *Apol.* has κακοδοξεῖν and κακοδοξία). Ἐξαμείβω (2, 2), ἀβρύνομαι (9, 2), ἐχθραίνω (11, 5), though poetical, cause us no surprise. Ἐξομλεῖν (11, 4) is rare and only cited from Euripides: the poetical λατρεύω (7, 2) is found in *Cyr.* 3, 1, 36 in a literal sense. Ὀξέτινχών = ὁ τυχών (1, 3) is not remarkable even if there is no other instance of it in X., nor is there anything very out-of-the-way in παντὰ τὰ αἰσχρὰ ἐξεδίωκεν (3, 1), if that reading is

right. Τὸ παρὰπαν (7, 7) is common enough, though X. seems not to have it elsewhere, but ἀντίπρῳκα (1, 18) is only quoted from Pollux. Τὸ στόμα τοῦ βίου (11, 15) is unique, if right. With μισθὸν λύσει in 2, 31, an unusual expression, cf. the words ἧς αἰ πρόσδοι λύνουσι τὰναλώματα in the fragment of Diphilus' Ἐμφορος given by Athenaeus 227 E. It may be observed that in *Mem.* 1, 2, 54 X. has the unusual expression μισθὸν τίνειν. A few points of syntax are just worth notice. There seems to be no precise parallel in X. to ἔρχομαι λέξων (2, 7), though *Anab.* 7, 7, 17 comes extremely close to it: but a construction that is used in Herodotus and Plato need not surprise us in X. The omission of μᾶλλον with αἰρεῖσθαι...ῃ (4, 5) may be the result of an accident, but the phrase is well established for good prose, even if undoubted writings of X. do not contain it. The construction of πράττειν in γῆμαι τὴν βασιλείας ἔπραττε θυγατέρα (3, 3) is unusual, but occurs in *Hell.* 6, 5, 6 ἔπραττον εἰν κατὰ χώραν τὴν πόλιν. For the infinitive in οὐκ ἐκρατήθη οὐθ' ὑπὸ δόρων οὐθ' ὑπὸ τῆς βασιλείας ῥώμης ἐθελῆσαι ξενωθῆναι αὐτῷ (8, 5) I do not find any precise parallel, but μηχανάσθαι with accusative and infinitive (6, 5) occurs *Hiero* 11, 4 and *Cyr.* 8, 2, 28 and 3, 1, and ὑφιστάμενος πολεμεῖν (6, 1) seems like *Cyr.* 6, 3, 35 ὑφίσταμαι...τάξιν ἔχειν. The use of διαγίνεσθαι (1, 4) and διατελεῖν (10, 4) with an adjective alone can be illustrated from *Hell.* 2, 3, 25: 4, 3, 3: *Mem.* 1, 6, 2, etc.

The upshot of this tedious inquiry seems to be that all parts of the *Agésilas* are full of characteristic Xn. words and that there is nowhere anything in the vocabulary or syntax that need raise the smallest doubt about the authorship. I know it may be said, and ought to be said, that in a minute verbal investigation like this the spirit of the writing is left out of account. The turn of the sentences is another thing from the vocabulary, another thing even from the syntax, and besides the turn of the sentences we have also the substance of the ideas themselves to consider. In this work, it is said, the turn of thought and expression is constantly different from the simplicity so characteristic of X. I am very much alive to this difference of spirit, which is indeed strongly marked; but for settling questions of authorship I think small matters of language are much more important. A man is not bound always to write in one and the same style, and I see no reason why X. should not, especially in a panegyric work, where more ornament was looked for, have tried to show what he could do in adopting a manner

not usual with him. In the *Memorabilia* 2, 1 he makes some attempt at emulating the μεγαλεία ῥήματα (*ib.* 34) of Prodicus, for it is very improbable that he is just borrowing them, and the same thing may be seen in a less marked degree in other parts of his writings. Here in his old age he seems to have said to himself, like his own Socrates, ἵνα καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν Γοργίουσι ῥήμασιν εἴπω (*Symp.* 2, 26), but it must be owned that the result is not very successful. Plainness was his strength, and the ornamental parts of the *Agésilas*, if not more empty than much of Isocrates, are not nearly so well turned as the periods of that skilful artist.

I add some suggestions on the text of the *Agésilas*. Though by no means in a bad condition now, it is all the worse for the fact that it was neglected by Cobet, who dealt at considerable length in the *Novae Lectiones* with all the *opera minora* except this and the *Apologia Socratis*. In an incidental remark however (p. 233) he refers to it as Xenophon's, and probably this expresses his opinion as to the authorship.

1, 2. τοῖς προγόνοις (Ἀγγισιλάου) ὀνομαζομένοις ἀπομνημονεύεται ὁπόστος ἀφ' Ἡρακλείους ἐγένετο.

No attempt to make sense of this can succeed, but it is not difficult to see what has happened. After ὁπόστος a very similar word has been accidentally omitted. Read ὁπόστος <ἕκαστος> ἀφ' Ἡ. ἐγένετο. 'It is always recorded for his various ancestors, when they are named, in what degree of descent from Heracles each stood.'

1, 3. ὥσπερ τὸ γένος αὐτῶν τῆς πατρίδος ἐντιμότατον, οὕτω καὶ ἡ πόλις ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἐνδοξοτάτη.

Τῆς πατρίδος ἐντιμότατον hardly seems grammar. Repeat a few letters so as to get <τῶν> τῆς πατρίδος, or read τῶν for αὐτῶν.

1, 6. Ἀγγισίλαος τοῖνυν ἐτι μὲν νέος ὢν ἔτυχε τῆς βασιλείας ἄρτι δ' ὄντος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ, ἐξηγγέλη βασιλεὺς ὁ Περσῶν ἀθροῖων καὶ ναυτικῶν καὶ πεζῶν πολὺ στράτευμα...βουλευομένων δέ...Ἀγγισίλαος ὑπέστη...διαβήσεσθαι εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν.

As Agesilaus was now somewhat over forty years of age, scholars have been staggered at the statement that he was ἐτι νέος. This has even been adduced as evidence against X.'s authorship; but, as Mr. Dakyns remarks, (although he seems to think there is something in the argument), it would be equally surprising whoever said it. Should we not read οὐκέτι μὲν νέος ὢν? In the statement as it stands with its μὲν and δέ there is no point. If A. had been

quite a young man, there might have been force in saying that he undertook the responsibility in spite of his youth, but in a man of forty this is ridiculous. What the writer means is that A., though no longer young and though quite new to power, had the enterprise to offer himself for an expedition against the Great King, and he goes on in the next sentence to say how people admired (πάνν ἡγάσθησαν) his spirit in actually seeking the enemy out (ἐπιόντα μάλλον ἢ ὑπομένοντα μάχεσθαι αὐτῷ).

As for the insertion of a negative, many scholars hardly recognise how common a thing in MSS. the accidental omission and also in a less degree the insertion of a negative has been. I will quote only the instance of one book. Professor Lewis Campbell says 'logical confusions, especially between affirmative and negative, positive and privative, are peculiarly frequent in the text of Plato. *There are more than fifty instances of this form of error in the Republic*: mostly however among the later MSS.' (Jowett and Campbell's *Republic* ii. p. 106). Almost all our MSS. of X. are late.

1, 8. πολλοὶ πάνν ἡγάσθησαν αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι κ.τ.λ.

We shall restore the usual phrase, if we read αὐτοῦ for αὐτό. Cf. 2, 7 ἀλλὰ μάλλον τὰδ' αὐτοῦ ἀγαμαί, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.: also 8, 4 and 6. But in view of § 9 ἐπεὶ γε μὴν λαβὼν τὸ στράτευμα ἐξέπλευσε, κ.τ.λ. I should prefer ἡγάσθησαν <αὐτοῦ> αὐτὸ τοῦτο.

1, 20. ἡ... χώρα οὐκ ἂν δύναιτο πολὺν χρόνον στράτευμα φέρειν.

For φέρειν read τρέφειν. (The two words occur together in § 21, where the meaning of φέρειν is different). I have suggested that the same error has crept into a line of Mimnermus (14, 11) ὅτ' ἀγγήσιν φέρετ' ὠκείος ἡελίοιο.

1, 27. Should the first ὅπου be ὅποτε? The mistake, if it is one, may have been due to the ὅπου just following.

Ibid. ὅπου γὰρ ἄνδρες θεοὺς μὲν σέβουσιν.

The parallel passage in *Hell.* has σέβουσιν and *Mem.* 4, 4, 19 is the only other passage where X. has the active. I should hesitate however to alter the more rare and poetical form. For πειθαρχίαν here *Hell.* by another variation has πειθαρχεῖν. In the next § the future ἐμβαλεῖν is perhaps shown to be right, as against ἐμβάλλειν in *Hell.*, by the future following a few lines later (διοίσειν), and αὐτῷ (*Ag.*) seems better than οὕτω (*Hell.*).

1, 28. πίνοντας δὲ καὶ ἀπόνους διὰ τὸ αἰεὶ ἐπ' ὀχημάτων εἶναι.

They did not spend all their time (αἰεὶ εἶναι) in carriages, but, when they travelled,

they always went in them. Read ἵναί. So Plato *Phaed.* 85 D ἐπὶ βεβασιωτέρων ὀχημάτων... διαπορευθῆναι.

1, 31. παρήγγειλε δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἱππέουσιν ἐμβάλλειν, ὥς αὐτοῦ τε καὶ παντὸς τοῦ στρατεύματος ἐπομένον.

He said they would follow, ἐπομένον. Correct also *Hell.* 3, 4, 23.

1, 32. καὶ οἱ μὲν πελτασταὶ ὥσπερ εἰκὸς ἐφ' ἀρπαγὴν ἐτρέποντο· ὁ δ' Ἀγησίλαος ἔχων κύκλω πάντα καὶ φίλια καὶ πολέμια περιστρατοπεδεύσατο.

Hell. has no ἔχων, and by itself it means nothing. Perhaps X. wrote ἔχων <τοῖς ἄλλοις>, or <τοῖς ἱππέας> or something similar. The peltasts are contrasted with other troops.

1, 37. Probably some later hand has inserted the second τὰς πόλεις before διατελέσαι.

2, 1. Agesilaus made a forced march, οὐ γὰρ ὥς ὑστερήσειε τῆς πατρίδος προθυμείτο. We cannot take this in its literal meaning, for it would be a poor encomium to pass upon a hero, that he was not anxious to be too late to save his country. If therefore the text is right—and I see no reason for altering it—we must understand οὐ προθυμείτο to be just like our 'he did not want to be late,' meaning 'he wanted not to be late.' Besides the common οὐ φημι, οὐκ ἀξίω, we may compare οὐ δοκῶ 'seem not' (e.g. *Ar. Eq.* 1146: *Peace* 1051), οὐ προσποιούμαι 'pretend not' (e.g. *Thuc.* 3, 47, 4: [*Dem.*] *Phil.* 4, 60) οὐ συμβουλεύω 'advise not' (*Herod.* 7, 46, 1).

2, 2. ἐκακούργον οὗτοι ἐφεπόμενοι.

Αὐτόν (*Hell.*) is clearly better than ο἗τοι, which would naturally come before ἐκακούργον, not after it. So is ἐπ' οὐρᾷ ἔχων than ἐπ' οὐρᾷ ἔχων, which seems questionable. 'Επ' οὐρᾷ is rightly used with παραπέμπων just afterwards.

2, 7. ὥς ἅπαντα μὲν χαλκόν, ἅπαντα δὲ φοινικᾷ φαίνεσθαι.

χαλκόν must have a corresponding substantive. Read φοινικίδα (or -ίδας) with Schneider. Cf. *Cyr.* 6, 4, 1 ἥστραπτε μὲν χαλκῷ, ἦνθει δὲ φοινικίσι πᾶσα ἡ στρατιή.

2, 8. ὥς πᾶσι πολλὰ κάγαθὰ εἴητο, εἰ ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ γίνοντο.

Probably γένοντο. He said ἔσται, εἰ γένησθε.

2, 13. καίπερ πολλὰ τραύματα ἔχων πάντοσε καὶ παντοίοις ὅπλοις ὅμως οὐκ ἐπλάθετο τοῦ θείου.

Hell. 4, 3, 20 has these words without πάντοσε... ὅπλοις, which by themselves are incomplete, like the ἔχων noticed in 1, 32. *Plutarch Ag.* 18 has πολλὰς... δεξιόμενον εἰς τὸ σῶμα πληγὰς δόρασι καὶ ξίφεσι. I conjecture

that some participle should be added referring either to A. or his assailants (e.g. ἐπικειμένων) and that πάντοσε should be πάντοθεν.

4, 3. τὸ δ', ὅποτε βούλοιο εὖ ποιεῖν ἢ πόλιν ἢ φίλους χρήμασι, δύνασθαι παρ' ἐτέρων λαμβάνοντα ὠφελεῖν, οὐ καὶ τοῦτο μέγα τεκμήριον ἐγκρατείας χρημάτων;

A man could hardly be said to prove his indifference to money by assisting country or friends for a consideration. This is another case of a missing negative. Read <μηδὲν> παρ' ἐτέρων λαμβάνοντα, and understand δύνασθαι of 'having the self-control,' 'having the high principle.' Somewhat similar is its use in 11, 10 ἔν γε μὴν ταῖς εὐπραξίαις σωφρονεῖν ἐπιστάμενος ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς εὐθαρσῆς ἐδύνατο εἶναι. Cf. Virgil *Aen.* vii. 308 *nō linquere inausum quae potui infelix.*

6, 7. When exposed to attack from the enemy, A. would make his men march ὥσπερ ἂν παρθένος ἢ σωφρονεστάτη, νομίζων ἐν τῷ τοιοῦτῳ τὸ τε ἀτρεμὲς καὶ ἀνεκπληκτότατον καὶ ἀθρομβητότατον καὶ ἀναμαρτητότατον καὶ δυσεπιβουλευτότατον εἶναι.

At the head of these polysyllabic superlatives the little positive ἀτρεμὲς is a παρθένος σωφρονεστάτη indeed. What if we were to take away τε, which some one has inserted through misapprehension? Agesilaus thought that on such an occasion slow, orderly, quiet movement (τὸ ἀτρεμὲς) was the surest safeguard against panic, disorder, error, and stratagem.

7, 6. μηχανὰς...αἰς πάντως ἡλπιζον εἰλεῖν τὰ τεύχη.

Ἄν should be added after or before εἰλεῖν. A simple aorist infinitive after ἐλπίζω is a solecism and may usually be turned into a future by the change of a letter or two, like aorists after ὄμνυμι.

7, 7. In ἐπεμελήθη δέ τις ἄλλος I would make the τις interrogative and not the verb. Cf. § 4 τίνα τις εἶδεν ἄλλον στρατηγόν κ.τ.λ.

8, 1. ὦ γε ὑπαρχόνσης μὲν τιμῆς...τὸ μὲν μέγανον οὐκ ἂν εἶδε τις.

Probably <ἐν>εἶδε should be read.

8, 8. καλὸν δοκεῖ εἶναι τεῖχη ἀνάλωτα κτᾶσθαι ἐπὶ πολέμιον.

For κτᾶσθαι read ἴσταςθαι. The confusion of κ and ισ is well known, and these particular words are confused over and over again. Κτᾶσθαι τεῖχη seems to me a phrase that a Greek was not very likely to use, whereas ἴσταναι τεῖχη is known from Thuc. 1, 69, 1 τὰ μακρὰ στήσαι τεῖχη: 1, 89, 4 τοῦ περιβάλλον βραχέα εἰστίγκει, etc. It is natural enough to use the middle, and X. constantly in *Hell.* has τρόπαιον ἴσταςθαι for the common τροπαίων ἴσταναι. So too, 6, 2 quoted below and again *ib.* 3.

The same mistake recurs, I think, in the last sentence of the book, μνημεῖα μὲν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρετῆς ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν κτησάμενος, τῆς δὲ βασιλικῆς ταφῆς ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τυχών. When we remember such expressions as Thuc. 2, 41, 4 πανταχοῦ μνημεῖα κακῶν τε κάγαθων αἰδία ἐνγκατοικισάντες and Lys. 10, 28 μνημεῖα...ἀνάκειται (of a real material μνημεῖον), we shall see that it ought to be μνημεῖα...στησάμενος. The τυχών which follows is not against this, but it may have helped the mistake. Cf. in 11, 7 τοῦ μὲν σώματος εἰκόνα στήσασθαι ἀπέχετο, and in 6, 2 τρόπαιον εἰστήσατο, ἀθάνατα μὲν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἀρετῆς μνημεῖα καταλιπών.

9, 1. ἀλλὰ μὴν ἐρῶ γε ὥς καὶ τὸν τρόπον ἐπεστήσατο τῇ τοῦ Πέρσου ἀλαζονείᾳ. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὁ μὲν..., Ἀγησίλαος δὲ κ.τ.λ.

There is no reason to think that ἐφίσταμαι can mean 'substitute' (Liddell and Scott). The meaning may be that he set up or established ways, habits, character for himself, which were a foundation (ἐπὶ) for his conduct; but I think this would be over-refining, and ἐφίσταμαι being frequently used in the sense of 'promising' or 'undertaking' (cf. 1, 7: 6, 1), I should suppose it to mean here that he took upon himself or adopted certain habits and principles. To find a construction for the dative we must add a word to which the general sense plainly points. Read ὥς καὶ τὸν τρόπον ἐπεστήσατο <ἐναντίον> τῇ τοῦ Πέρσου ἀλαζονείᾳ, unless we should substitute ἐναντίον for καὶ τόν.

9, 3. ὅπως γε μὴν καταδάρθῃ οὐδ' ἂν εἴποι τις ὅσα πραγματεύονται.

The optative is ungrammatical. Either read καταδάρθῃ, or add ἂν as in the preceding sentence, τί ἂν ἡδέως πίοι...τί ἂν ἡδέως φύγοι. (Goodwin *M.* and *T.* p. 403).

9, 4. ἡγάλλετο ὅτι αὐτὸς μὲν ἐν μέσῃς ταῖς εὐφροσύναις ἀναστρέφοιτο, τὸν δὲ βάρβαρον ἐώρα, εἰ μέλλοι ἀλύτως βιώσεσθαι, συνελκυστέον αὐτῷ ἀπὸ περάτων τῆς γῆς τὰ τέρφηοντα.

The latter part of this is totally devoid of construction. Read αὐτῷ and add some such word as ἡγούμενον or νομίζοντα. He saw that the king thought he must gather together dainties from the ends of the earth. Τέρφηοντα <νομίζοντα> is attractive, but the homeoteleuton is not needed to make the omission probable. Perhaps συνελκυστέον αὐτῷ <εἶναι ἡγούμενον>.

10, 3. ἄπερ ζῶν ἤκουε, ταῦτα καὶ νῦν λέγεται περὶ αὐτοῦ.

Perhaps ταῦτά, as ὁ αὐτός and ὥσπερ are regular correlatives. In 8, 7 θεασάσθω δὲ τὰς θύρας αὐτοῦ· εἰκάσειε γὰρ ἂν τις ἔτι ταῦτας ἐκείνας εἶναι ὥσπερ Ἀριστόδημος...ἐπεστήσατο.

I suspect ταύτας should be τὰς αὐτάς or more probably αὐτάς.

11, 8. τῷ μὲν δίκαιῳ ἀρκεῖν ἡγούμενος τὸ εἶναι τὰ ἀλλότρια, τῷ δ' ἐλευθερίῳ καὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ προσωφελήτεον εἶναι.

Τῶν ἑαυτοῦ cannot be a partitive genitive. Such a genitive could only be used here after a verb usually taking an accusative, 'give (some) of his own money,' etc. It never occurs except as the object, if so it may be called, of such a transitive verb. It is clear that an ἀπό or ἐκ has been lost here. Probably καὶ stands for κακ.

11, 14. οὐκ ἀπέπεε μεγάλῃν καὶ καλὴν ἐφίμενος δόξαν.

The accusative after ἐφίεσθαι would be

unique. Τοῦτ' ἐφίεσαι (Soph. O.T. 766: Linwood τοῦδ' ἐφίεσαι) is quite different by reason of τοῦτο being a neuter pronoun and = 'having this desire.' Perhaps Schneider is right in doubting ἐφίμενος. Some change is indispensable.

11, 15. καίπερ ἤδη πρὸς τῷ στόματι τοῦ βλοῦν ὄν.

X. uses στόμα in a peculiar way of the front ranks of an army, but neither that nor any other use of it seems exactly parallel to this. In R.L. 10, 1 we have ἐπὶ τῷ τέρματι τοῦ βλοῦν, and possibly X. wrote that here, but I should hardly venture to substitute it.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

SABELLUS: SABINE OR SAMNITE?

It is a curious fact that, in an age remarkable for the enormous advances which are being made in lexicography and the interpretation of the classical authors, our feeling for the meaning of any word should be getting blunted; but such seems to me to be the case in regard to the word *Sabellus*. Scholars of the 16th cent. (Lambinus, Lipsius, Cluver) and Niebuhr, seem to have been quite familiar with the fact that *Sabellus* may denote 'Samnite,' though they often hesitated as to the possibility of its also meaning 'Sabine.' But modern lexicographers and commentators seem to be gradually settling down to the idea that it always means 'Sabine'; Lewis and Short exclude 'Samnite' altogether, and commentators on Horace and Virgil posterior to Conington adopt the same attitude.¹ Yet I hope to show that in the large majority, at any rate, of the passages in which the word is found in the ordinary classical authors the meaning is 'Samnite' and not 'Sabine.' My argument has also an important bearing on the question of the nationality of Horace. I think it may be inferred from his use of

the word *Sabellus* that he was of Samnite blood, perhaps belonging to a family which was enslaved during the Samnite wars. It may be replied, of course, that Samnite and Sabine are ultimately the same; that the Samnites were an offshoot of the Sabines of Sabina. Be this as it may—and I would leave the question to be settled by historians of Rome²—it does not affect my argument, which is that in current use the word *Sabelli* denoted to the Romans the offshoot and not the parent stock, or the offshoot rather than the parent stock. The evidence for this is to my mind so clear that I can only explain the statements of the lexicographers to the contrary by the supposition that they have been the victims of their philology; the connexion between *Sabellus* and *Sabinus* seemed to them obvious, and they did not see the still closer connexion between *Sabellus* and *Samnis* or *Samnitis* (= *Safnis*, *Safnitis*).³

But whether or no, it is impossible to dispose of the fact that there is no single passage in Horace or Virgil which demands the sense 'Sabine,' whereas there are many passages in these and other authors which either absolutely demand the sense 'Samnite' or on a fair interpretation make for that sense. Absolutely demanded it is in Livy viii. 1, 7 (dealing with the events of

¹ Thus, too, Sir E. H. Bunbury in the *Encycl. Brit.* (SABINES), vol. xxi. p. 129: '*Sabellus* is frequently found in Latin writers as an ethnic adjective equivalent to Sabine; but the practice adopted by modern writers of using it to denote all tribes of Sabine origin, including the Samnites, Lucanians, etc. was first introduced by Niebuhr and is not supported by any ancient authority.' The first part of this statement I consider wrong. *Ibid.* 'All readers of Horace must be familiar with his frequent allusions to the moral purity and frugal manners of the people that surrounded his *Sabine villa*.' The italics are mine and I venture to put a query to them.

² Prof. R. S. Conway informs me that the Sabine dialect may with certainty be inferred from the glosses that survive to have belonged to the Latin group, not to the Umbro-oscian group of dialects.

³ *Sabellus* would, I think, be a diminutive of a stem *Safn-* or *Safen-*, rather than of *Sabino-*; but it is a pure Latin word as Latin is the only dialect which rejects medial *f*.—R. S. Conway.

B.C. 341) *alteri consuli Aemilio ingresso Sabellum agrum non castra Samnitium, non legiones usquam oppositae*: x. 19, 20 (B.C. 296) *cohortium Sabellarum*. So too in Horace *Sat.* ii. 1, 36 (relating to the foundation of Venusia in B.C. 291 after the close of the third Samnite War); I quote from line 34: *sequor hunc Lucanus an Apulus anceps*: | *nam Venusinus arat finem sub utrumque colonus* | *missus ad hoc pulsus, vetus est ut fama, Sabellis*, | *quo ne per vacuum Romano incurreret hostis, sive quod Apula gens seu quod Lucania bellum* | *incuteret violenta*. Here *Sabellus* clearly means 'Samnite,' and we may also note the use of the plural as a noun, 'the Samnites,' a use found also in Pliny iii. 12, 107, (quoted below). What tribes precisely Horace would have included under the term is of course uncertain; but it is clear that the Sabines of Sabina were not prominently before his mind when he wrote this line.¹ *Lucanus* and *Apulus* are geographical expressions, which have no direct relation to the ethnic term *Sabellus*; but, to say the least, there is nothing here to prevent our regarding the inhabitants of these districts from being included among the *Sabelli*. In the light of this passage is it possible to doubt that when Horace calls himself *Sabellus* in *Epist.* i. 16, 49 (*renuit negitque Sabellus*) he is referring to his Apulian origin, and not to the fact that he possessed an estate in the Sabine country² (as all commentators that I have seen incline to think)? To my mind *Sabellus* here means 'Samnite'; and Horace is tracing his gift of shrewd common sense to his Samnite ancestors, just as in the passage above cited (*Sat.* ii. 1, 34 foll.) he traces his Lucilian pugnacity to his connexion with the same gallant race. Again the Sabellian crone of *Sat.* i. 9, 29 who prophesied as to his future when he was a child should surely be located in Apulia, not in Sabina. In *Epod.* xvii. 28 (*Sabella pectus increpare carmina, caputque Marsa dissilire nenia*) the juxtaposition of the words *Sabellus* and *Marsus* points in the same direction.³ *Od.* iii. 6, 38 (*Sabellis doctus*

ligonibus versare glebas) would be inconclusive either way, were we not reminded by the whole passage (33-40) of the *Marsus et Apulus* of the preceding ode (l. 9).

When Horace means 'Sabine,' he says *Sabinus*: *Od.* i. 9, 7 (*Sabina diota*), i. 20, 1 (*vile Sabinum*), i. 22, 9 (*silva in Sabina*, a wood on his Sabine estate, as Dr. Gow says in his excellent edition), ii. 18, 14 (*unicis Sabinis*), iii. 1, 47 (*valle Sabina*), iii. 4, 22 (*in arduos Sabinos*), *Epod.* ii. 41 (*Sabina qualis aut perusta solibus pernicis uxor Apuli*: in fact *qualis Sabina aut Sabella*), *Epist.* i. 7, 77 (*arvum coelumque Sabinum*), ii. 1, 25 (*vel cum rigidis aequala Sabinis*), *Sat.* ii. 7, 118 (*opera agro nona Sabino*).

The same tale is told by the Virgilian use of the two words *Sabellus* and *Sabinus* (metrical equivalents). Conington on *Georg.* ii. 167 and *Aen.* vii. 665 interprets *Sabellus* as 'Samnite'; and this is I think supported by the proximity of *Marsi* in the former passage. *Aen.* viii. 510 (*mixtus matre Sabella*) is inconclusive; so is *Georg.* iii. 255 (*Sabellus sus*). But could Virgil have written *raptas sine more Sabellas* in *Aen.* viii. 635, instead of *r. s. m. Sabinas*? For his use of *Sabinus* see also *Georg.* ii. 532 (*veteres Sabini*), *Aen.* vii. 709 (*postquam in partem data Roma de sanguine*), *ibid.* 706 (*Sabinorum prisco de sanguine*); *ibid.* 178 (*Sabinus* as a proper name).

Turning to Juvenal we find that he too uses two distinct words, *Sabellus* and *Sabinus*, presumably in distinct senses: iii. 169 *ad Marsos mensamque Sabellam* (in the same connexion as in *Hor. Epod.* xvii. 28), *ibid.* 85 *baca Sabina*, x. 229 *veteres imitata Sabinos*.

To these passages I have to add two distinct statements by classical writers of widely different ages to the same effect. Varro, *Sat. Menipp.* 17 (ed. Bücheler) says *Terra culturae causa attributa olim particulatim hominibus, ut Etruria Tuscis, Samnium Sabellis*: this passage is quoted by Junius Philargyrius on *Virg. Georg.* ii. 167, and seems tolerably conclusive. Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* iii. 12, 107 *Samnitium, quos Sabellos et Graeci Samnitas dicere, colonia Bovianum, etc.*

The above does not claim to be an exhaustive list of instances. But I should be surprised if the evidence which it affords is overthrown by any passages which can be cited. What is the evidence for *Sabellus* = 'Sabine'?

E. A. SONNENSCHN. E.

¹ If Horace included the Sabines, we have an instance of the word in a classical author in the Niebuhrian sense.

² A man who owns a Scottish moor does not for that reason call himself a Scot!

³ So at least thought Niebuhr, *Hist. of Rome*, p. 91 'The Marsians, Pelignians, Samnites and Lucanians called themselves *Sarini* [Safinim?]; this is certain at least about the Samnites, from the denary coined during the Social War.' How far more modern research confirms the connexion between the Marsi and the Samnites I do not undertake to say.

ON A POINT OF METRE IN GREEK TRAGEDY.

PUPILS learning to scan and write Greek Iambics, anapaestic dimeters, or trochaic tetrameters catalectic, are told that before a mute followed by a liquid or nasal it is permissible to lengthen the syllable, or rather that they are at full liberty to treat such a syllable as either long or short according to the requirements of the metre. The usual qualification is, of course, made that, before the 'soft' mutes β . γ . δ . followed by λ . μ . ν ., the syllable is always long. In composing Attic senarii the average pupil (and, may we not say, teacher?) would not, therefore, see anything to which to object, on metrical grounds, in such a line as that of Archilochus

κύψαντες ἴβριν ἀθρόγην ἀπέφλυσαν,

and probably both teacher and pupil would be surprised to learn that this single verse contains as many 'lengthenings' as occur on the average in 240 lines of Aeschylus, 120 lines of Sophocles, and, say, 150 lines of Euripides.

In the *Arundines Cami* (6th edit. p. 307) the reader will find an eminent scholar writing in anapaestic dimeters

ρείθροισ πρηγέσιν Ἀτλαντείους
δίφρος ὁ Φοῖβον χρυσεόκυκλος,

and no suspicion will cross his mind that there could be anything 'unusual' in the sound of these lines to the ears of an Athenian audience.

Again, he may be reading the *Electra* of Euripides and find verse 629 printed thus:—

οὐδείς παρῆν Ἀργείος, ὀθνεία δὲ χεῖρ,

and on glancing at the footnote he may observe the brief remark "*οικεία* L. *ὀθνεία* Camper." He may (and should) consider the emendation no emendation, but it would almost certainly surprise him to learn that there is no instance in all tragedy of a lengthening before *θν* in senarii, anapaestic dimeters, or trochaic tetrameters. Despite the temptations of *τεθνάναι*, *ἔθνος*, etc., the lengthening nowhere occurs.

In the lacuna of Aesch. *Agam.* 1664

σώφρονος γνώμης δ' ἄμαρτεῖν τὴν κρατοῦντα —v—

the student will usually find supplied '*θ'* ἰβρίσαι Blomfield,' and, familiar as he is

NO. XCIX. VOL. XI.

with ἴβρις in Aeschylus, he will have no doubt on the score of quantity. Nevertheless, in the kinds of verse above enumerated, Aeschylus never has ἴβρις or ἰβρίζειν either in the plays or the fragments. He may, of course, have lengthened the syllable in this instance, but, as the conjecture is probably wholly wrong for other reasons, he almost certainly did not. Sophocles, indeed, has the word (or its cognates) with lengthening seven times; but in an emendation of Aeschylus it is the probabilities for Aeschylus alone which must be considered.

It therefore appears that the importance of this question extends far beyond the elegant exercises of schoolboys and undergraduates, though even these deserve to be carried out with absolute accuracy if they are to be carried out at all. And in the latter connexion it may be remarked, for instance, that a teacher of Greek verses of the kinds specified should decline to admit any lengthening of an initial augment in these so-called optional positions, on the ground that, in all the many thousands of such verses in Attic tragedy, no instances are discoverable but ἐκλήθης and ἐπλήσθη (each once in Euripides). ἔθρισε (once in Aeschylus) is evidently not to be brought into the question, being a syncopated form.

The common words ἄγρός, ἐρνθρός, πικρός, ἀκμή, ἰκνεῖσθαι, δίφρος, τέχνη, etc. do much duty in Greek composition, and probably have their lengthenings almost as often as not. And yet it remains a fact that, in the three metres above-named, ἄγρός occurs with lengthening but twice (ἀγρόθεν once), ἐρνθρός not at all (except in the proper noun Ἐρνθραί), πικρός only twice (πικρότης once), ἀκμή once (ἀκμαῖος once), ἰκνεῖσθαι once (ἀφικνεῖσθαι once), δίφρος once, τέχνη once (τεχνᾶσθαι once).

I have examined with some care the senarii, anapaestic dimeters and trochaic tetrameters of the plays and fragments of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, and though I am not prepared to make an affidavit that I have overlooked no single instance of lengthening (*ars longa vita brevis*), I think it highly improbable that any considerable error will be found in the data afforded by the following tables. It will be seen at once that the lengthenings are mainly confined to certain groups of words. Other deductions will be given at the end of the lists.

Total Number of Lengthenings in the Plays and Fragments of the Tragic Dramatists (omitting for the present the *Rhesus*, *Cyclops*, *Iphigenia in Aulis* and satyric fragments) in iambic senarii, anapaestic dimeters and trochaic tetrameters.

| | AESCH. | SOPH. | EUR. | TOTAL. |
|------------------|--------|-------|------|--------|
| βρ | | | | |
| ἄβρός | — | — | 3 | 3 |
| ἄβρότης | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἄβροδίατος | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| ἄβροχίτων | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| νεβρίς | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ὑβρίς | — | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| ὑβρίζειν | — | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| ἐφ— | — | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| καθ— | — | 2 | 6 | 8 |
| ἐγκαθ— | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ὑβριστής | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| γρ | | | | |
| ἄγριος | 3 | 11 | 14 | 28 |
| ἄγριωπός | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἄγρός | — | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| ἄγρόθεν | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἄγραυλος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἄγρα | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἄγρεύω | — | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| ἄγρυπνος | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| σάαγρος | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| φλεγυραίος | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| ὑγρός | — | — | 3 | 3 |
| ὑγρότης | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ὑγραίνειν | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ὑγρόβολος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| δρ | | | | |
| ἔδρα | — | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| σύνεδρος | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| ἐφ— | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| προσ— | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| παρ— | — | — | 2 | 2 |
| συνεδρία | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| προσ— | — | — | 2 | 2 |
| ἐφεδρεύω | — | — | 2 | 2 |
| προσ— | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| αἰδρίς | 1 | 1 | — | 2 |
| ἰδρύω | — | — | 2 | 2 |
| καθ— | — | — | 2 | 2 |
| ἐγκαθ— | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἀνιδρυτός | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| κέδρος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| κέδρινος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἄδραστος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἐπιδρομή | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| θρ | | | | |
| μέλαθροι | 4 | 1 | 27 | 32 |
| ὑλεθρος | — | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| ὀλέθριος | — | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| λάθρα | — | — | 2 | 2 |
| λαθραίως | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| Ἐρυθραί | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἔθρυσσα | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| ἀπ— | — | — | 2 | 2] |
| (syncopated) | | | | |
| θλ | | | | |
| γένεθλον | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| γενέθλιος | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

| | AESCH. | SOPH. | EUR. | TOTAL. |
|--------------------------|--------|-------|------|--------|
| θμ | | | | |
| ἄριθμός | 2 | 4 | 16 | 22 |
| ἀριθμεῖν | — | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| ἀναριθμητός | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| τοσουτᾶριθμος | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| θν | | | | |
| (none) | | | | |
| κρ | | | | |
| ἄκρος | 3 | 8 | 12 | 23 |
| ἀκραῖος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἀκροθίνιον | 1 | — | 3 | 4 |
| Ἀκροκόρινθος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ὑπερακρίσειν | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| νεκρός | 2 | 3 | 17 | 22 |
| δάκρυα (not sing.) | — | 4 | 18 | 22 |
| δακρύνει | — | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| δακρυς | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἀρτίδακρυς | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| πικρός | — | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| πικρότης | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| μακρός | — | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| ἀποκρύπτειν | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| ἀποκρίνειν | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| ἐπικραίνω | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| ἐπικρανόν | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἐπικρύπτω | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ὀκρῖς | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| ἀκραγής | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| κλ | | | | |
| κύκλος | 1 | — | 2 | 3 |
| Κύκλωπες | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| κέκλημαι | — | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| ἐκλήθησεν | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| κυκλήσκειν | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ὀμοκλή | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| ὀμοκλῆιν | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Ἡρακλῆς | — | — | 14 | 14 |
| Πάτροκλος | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Ἀμυκλαί | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἀκλεής | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἐπέκλωσεν | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| κατακλύσειν | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| κμ | | | | |
| ἄκμή | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἄκμαῖος | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| κν | | | | |
| τέκνον | — | 31 | 77 | 108 |
| ἄτεκνος | — | — | 10 | 10 |
| ὄκνος | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| δοκνῶ | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| ὄκνῶ | — | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| κατ— | 1 | 1 | — | 2 |
| πρόκνη | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| Κύκνος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| κυκνόμορφος | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| ἱκνεῖσθαι | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| ἀφ— | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| πρ | | | | |
| Κύπρις | — | 2 | 14 | 16 |
| Κύπρος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| θεόπρπος | 1 | — | — | 1 |

| | AESCH. | SOPH. | EUR. | TOTAL. | | AESCH. | SOPH. | EUR. | TOTAL. |
|--------------------|--------|-------|------|--------|------------------|--------|-------|------|--------|
| πλ | | | | | φρ | | | | |
| πέπλος | 1 | 2 | 11 | 14 | ἐλαφρός | 1 | — | 1 | 2 |
| ὄπλα | — | 4 | 18 | 22 | ἐλαφρίζω | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ὀπλίτης | — | — | 4 | 4 | ἄφρων | — | — | 2 | 2 |
| ὀπλίσειν | — | — | 1 | 1 | κακόφρων | — | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| ἄνθος | — | — | 1 | 1 | φιλοφρόνως | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| ἐπλήσθη | — | — | 1 | 1 | ἄφρός | — | — | 3 | 3 |
| διπλός | 1 | — | — | 1 | Ἀφροδίτη | — | — | 5 | 5 |
| πν | | | | | ὄφρὺς | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ῥνός | — | 6 | 3 | 9 | ὄφρῦ | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἄπνος | 1 | — | 2 | 3 | δίφρος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἐνύπνιον | 2 | — | — | 2 | Ἀρταφρένης | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| ἐριπναί | — | — | 1 | 1 | φλ | | | | |
| Θέραπναι | — | — | 1 | 1 | τυφλός | — | — | 5 | 5 |
| τρ | | | | | ἐπέφλεγε | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| πατρός(-ί) | 3 | 49 | 78 | 130 | φν | | | | |
| πατρίς | — | 1 | 11 | 12 | ἄφρεός | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| πάτριος | — | 1 | — | 1 | ἔπεφνε | — | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| πατρικός | — | — | 1 | 1 | χρ | | | | |
| πατρώος | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | πολύχρυσος | — | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| πατρόθεν | — | 1 | — | 1 | λέχριος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| πατροφόντης | — | 2 | — | 2 | χλ | | | | |
| Ἀτρεὺς | 1 | 3 | 5 | 9 | ὄχλος | — | — | 9 | 9 |
| Ἀτρεΐδαι | — | 9 | — | 9 | ἀναμοχλεύω | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| θυγατρός(-ί) | — | 2 | 11 | 13 | χμ | | | | |
| πέτρα | — | 1 | 5 | 6 | λιχμῶν | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| πέτρος | — | 1 | 5 | 6 | ὀχμάζειν | 1 | — | — | 1 |
| πετρήρης | — | 1 | — | 1 | χν | | | | |
| μέτρον | — | 1 | 1 | 2 | ἶχνος | — | 1 | 6 | 7 |
| μέτριος | — | — | 1 | 1 | ἰχνεύω | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| μετρεῖν | — | — | 1 | 1 | ἰτέχνη | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| ἀμέτρητος | — | — | 1 | 1 | τεχνᾶσθαι | — | 1 | — | 1 |
| γηροτρόφος | — | — | 1 | 1 | λίχνος | — | — | 1 | 1 |
| μηλο | 1 | — | — | 1 | | | | | |
| παντο | 1 | — | — | 1 | | | | | |
| ὀτρύνω | — | 1 | — | 1 | | | | | |
| ἐπ | — | 1 | — | 1 | | | | | |
| ἀποτρέπουσι | 1 | — | — | 1 | | | | | |
| ἀπότροπος | — | — | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| ἀποτροπή | 1 | — | — | 1 | | | | | |
| λατρεύω | 1 | 1 | — | 2 | | | | | |
| ἄροτρον | 1 | — | — | 1 | | | | | |
| ἄρτυτος | 1 | — | — | 1 | | | | | |
| ἀλγίτριος | — | 1 | — | 1 | | | | | |
| ἱτρία | — | 1 | — | 1 | | | | | |
| φάρετρα | — | — | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| ἰστοτριβής | 1 | — | — | 1 | | | | | |
| προτρέπω | — | 1 | — | 1 | | | | | |
| Ἀμφιτρυών | — | — | 2 | 2 | | | | | |
| ἐπιτρέπω (?) | — | — | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| τλ | | | | | | | | | |
| σχέτλιος | 1 | 3 | 5 | 9 | | | | | |
| ἀνατλάς | — | — | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| τμ | | | | | | | | | |
| πότμος | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | | | | | |
| ἄτμος | 1 | — | 1 | 2 | | | | | |
| ἄτμιζω | — | 1 | — | 1 | | | | | |
| ἔρετμά | — | — | 2 | 2 | | | | | |
| ἔρετμός | — | — | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| ἐφετμή | 4 | — | — | 4 | | | | | |
| τν | | | | | | | | | |
| πότνια | — | 2 | 8 | 10 | | | | | |
| πίτνω | — | — | 1 | 1 | | | | | |
| προ | — | 1 | — | 1 | | | | | |
| προσ | — | — | 1 | 1 | | | | | |

The *Rhesus* and the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, by reason of their dubious authenticity, and the *Cyclops*, in view of its peculiar metrical character as a satyric play, seem to require separate examination. The result is striking. No new groups or elements whatever are added to the lists given above, except *τετράπους* (*Rhes.* 211) and *ἄκρατος* (*Cycl.* 149). Thus the additions fall under heads previously found, as follows: *ἄβρότης* (1), *καθυβρίζειν* (1); *ῥγρός* (1); *ἐδραῖος* (1), *ἔφεδρος* (2); *γένεθλον* (3); *μέλαθρον* (5); *Κύκλωψ* (4); *τέκνον* (7); *ἄκρος* (1), *ἀκροθίνιον* (1), *δάκρυα* (7); *ὄπλα* (1), *ὀπλίζειν* (2); *ῥνός* (2), *ἄπνος* (2); *ἐφετμή* (1), *ἐρετμά* (1), *πότμος* (1); *πότνια* (1); *πατρός* (2), *πατρίς* (2), *πατρώος* (1), *πάτριος* (1), *πέτρα* (1), *πετρώος* (1), *θυγατρός* (5), *Ἀτρεὺς* (4), *φάρετρα* (1); *τυφλοῦν* (1); *Ἀφροδίτη* (1), *ὄφρὺς* (1), *κακόφρωνες* (1); *ὄχλος* (3); *ἶχνος* (1), *ἰχνεύω* (1).

The conclusions which I draw from the data are briefly these:—

(a) That the lengthening was habitual only to certain words e.g. *τέκνον* and *πατρός*

(which two, with their cognates amount to about one-third of the whole number).

(b) That words which were lengthened with anything like frequency were archaic words, proper names, and words necessarily very familiar in a lengthened quantity in epic and gnomic poetry, from which they brought literary associations, e.g. μέλαθρον, γένεθλον, πότνια; Ἡρακλῆς, Κύπρις, Ἀτρεΐς; δάκρυα, ὕβρις, ὄπλα, νεκρός, etc.

(c) That in other cases the lengthening was abnormal, and as conscious and cautious as in μοῖνος, ξείνος, etc., or as in φαῖδχίτωνες, ὄφης, or even as in the use of the forms μέσσος, χείρεσσι, ἤμμε, etc. which occur once or twice in senarii. There seems to be no other way of accounting for the fact that many words common in tragedy should receive lengthening only once in many thousands of lines, while others, which would seem to offer occasion enough, are not lengthened at all.

These conclusions are borne out by two considerations: (i) the paratragedia of comedy, which at once shows itself by these occasional lengthenings, implies that Athenian ears were quick at detecting them, that, therefore, they were distinctly artificial, and that an excess of them in dialogue would have bordered on the absurd: (ii) the tragic senarius is, according to Aristotle, λεκτικόν, and as, therefore, it avoids γλῶσσαι and other rarities, so it avoids that which in any other way departs too far from the ordinary λέξις.

For fear any stubborn reader of these remarks should suspect that the lengthenings may, after all, have been largely a matter of accident, and that the tragedians lengthened at any time and with any frequency to suit their metre, the conclusive answer had better be stated at once. Archilochus has on the average one lengthening in 5 lines, Simonides two in 9 lines, Solon two in 13 lines, Hipponax two in 13. (Aeschylus has one in 80.) If with all the resources of their tongue at their disposal these writers found frequent lengthening convenient, why should not the tragedians find it equally so for the same metres? And if it is replied that Archilochus or Simonides or Solon deliberately sought such lengthenings for 'poetical' purposes, and went beyond mere convenience for the sake of effect, is it not thereby conceded that the tragedians did not seek them for such poetical purposes, had no desire to create the same effect, and were more cautious of departing from the current pronunciation? Moreover, if convenience had determined the matter, it must have been a remarkable series of accidents which left tens of thousands of lines with only two initial augmentations lengthened, and with only isolated instances in such convenient words as ἐπικραίνειν, λάθρα, ἀπότηπος, etc.

T. G. TUCKER.

University of Melbourne.

PARTIAL OBLIQUITY IN QUESTIONS OF RETORT.

THE origin of the well-known use of *ut* in the exclamatory question seems to me not yet adequately explained. Of the advanced school-grammars used in America Allen and Greenough's classes this locution as a result-clause of elliptical nature: elliptical certainly in the examples they have chosen: (1) Cic. Cat. 1. 9.—*quamquam quid loquor? te ut ulla res frangat?* Here, however, *ut* is a purpose-particle after *loquor*, or rather the repetend '*loquar*' which must be supplied: (2) Cic. Tusc. ii. 42—*Age, sis, nunc de ratione videamus, nisi quid vis ad haec.* ‡ *Egone* (sc. '*velim*') *ut te interellem?* *ne hoc quidem vellem.* (3) Cic. ad Quint. Frat. i. 3—*mi frater...tunc id veritus es, ne ego iracundia aliqua adductus pueros ad te sine litteris miserim? aut etiam ne te videre noluerim? Ego tibi irascerer, tibi ego irasci*

possem?.....Ego te videre noluerim? Obviously the last question is a mere repetend, and the omission of the *ut* should have warned against the explanation of the locution as a result-clause.

Gildersleeve denies a conscious ellipsis, but seems to lean to the result-clause, saying in a note: The expression is closely parallel with the Acc. and Infin. The one objects to the idea; the other to any state of things that could produce the result.

The nearest approach I have seen to the explanation I am about to suggest is to be found in Riemann's *Syntaxe Latine*² § 168: Le latin emploie le subjonctif (présent ou parfait) dans une proposition interrogative pour marquer qu'on proteste énergiquement contre telle ou telle affirmation...(ego, tibi irascar? 'moi, me fâcher contre toi').

Further on, in a footnote: *s'il est question du passé, on emploie, dans le même sens, l'imparfait du subjonctif (ici l'affirmation contre laquelle on proteste serait à l'aoriste de l'indicatif); ego tibi irascerer? 'moi, me fâcher contre toi (à tel moment du passé)?'* A subsequent footnote suggests that this use of the subjunctive is akin to the deliberative.

I would myself refer the locution just described to partial obliquity, and cite the following example,

Plaut. Most. 556 :

quid nunc faciundum censes? ‡ Egon quid censeam?

Here *quid censeam* is a repetend, echoing *quid censes*, and its mood is due to virtual oratio obliqua. The phrase is shorthand for *Rogasne quid censeam?* just as in the stock example, Socrates accusatus est quod iuventutem corrumpere, '*quod corrumpere*' is shorthand for *quod—corrumpere dicebant*.

The echoing subjunctive is a common feature of Plautus's style. Thus at Capt. 208 *fugam fingitis* is echoed in retort by the query *fugiamus nos?* and at 139 *egone illum non fleam?* is the retort to *ne fle*. At Most. 182-3 the echo is affected by change of tense:

ita Philolaches tuos te amet.

‡ ...quo modo adiurasti? ita ego istam amarem?

Just so, in Cicero's letter to Quintus cited above, *ego tibi irascerer* is an echo of the words *tu mihi irascaris* or *vereor ne tu mihi irascaris*, say, which must have stood in Quintus's letter.

It is along this line that I would explain the construction of *ut* in the exclamatory question. Riemann has already seen the analogy between these *ut*-sentences and the echoing subjunctive, but declares for an ellipsis, thus saying that *ut* governs the subjunctive in this locution.

I cite the following instances from Plautus.

(1) Men. 681-3 :

tibi dedi equidem illam (sc. pallam)...
et illud spinter...

‡ mihi tu ut dederis pallam et spinter?

Here it is perfectly clear (cf. Capt. 208 cited above) that sense and grammar admit of the excision of *ut* altogether. We might render the retort colloquially thus: *How!* You gave me a cloak and brooch?

(2) Most. 1017 :

Quod me absente hic tecum filius
negoti gessit! ‡ mecum ut ille hic gesserit
dum tu hinc abes, negoti?

Here the retort echoes the question so exactly word for word, that one is almost tempted to believe that *ut* repeats *quod*.

(3) Pers. 131 :

hic leno neque te novit neque gnatam tuam,
‡ Me ut quisquam norit, nisi ille qui praebet
cibum?

The *ut* could be dispensed with equally well in all three examples, and I do not think it at all necessary to render *ut?* by *how?* in every case. In Plautus the question 'are you well?' may be asked in three ways: (1) *vales?* (2) *valen* (= *valesne*)? (3) *ut vales?* and I take it that *ut* means no more than *-ne*. Analogous uses of *ut*, not to go here into etymological considerations, are found in the optative phrases *valeat*, *ut valeat*, where *ut* adds no appreciable force; and in the jussive-phrases *ea mihi reddas*, *ea ut mihi reddas* (cf. Rud. 1127), where also the *ut* is of a vanishing nature. I do not supply myself any *vide* in such sentences, but believe that *vide* arose later to reinforce, or motivate an *ut* no longer understood. The use of *ne* and *ut* in indirect commands can only have been based, in my opinion, on *ne* and *ut* used for direct commands.

In a like fashion the interrogative force of *ut* was dying out, and so *-ne* came in to reinforce it. The chain of development was after this fashion:

(1) *indotatam te uxorem patiar?* without interrogative sign. (Capt. 208).

(2) *ut indotatam te uxorem patiar?* with interrogative sign. (Cf. Most. 1017).

(3) *egone indotatam te uxorem patiar?* = (1) reinforced by interrogative *-ne*. (Cf. Capt. 139).

(4) *egone indotatam te uxorem ut patiar* (Trin. 378)? = (2) reinforced by an interrogative sign after *ut* began to wane as a pale interrogative.

This explanation of the 'exclamatory-question *ut*' seems to me to be confirmed by the use of the accusative and infinitive in the same way, but in the latter case the obliquity is complete. A good example is Aeneid 1. 37, *mene incepto desistere?* which echoes an implied *incepto tuo desiste*. In Terence (Hec. 612) the same usage appears without interrogative signs: *hinc abire matrem?*

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.

A STYLISTIC VALUE OF THE PARENTHETIC PURPOSE-CLAUSE.

Liv. vii. 1. 7. ne quando a metu ac periculis vacarent pestilentia ingens orta, etc.

Ib. 27. 1. ne nimis laetae res essent pestilentia civitatem adorta coegit etc.

Ib. x. 1. 4. tamen, ne prorsus inbellem agerent annum, parva expeditio in Umbria facta est, etc.

Ib. 6. 3. tamen, ne undique tranquillae res essent, certamen iniectum inter primores civitatis, etc.

Ib. vi. 34. 5. ne id nimis laetum parti alteri esset parva—causa intervenit, etc.

There is some difficulty about the *ne*-clauses here. Purpose-clauses they are, but they do not stand in a simple relation to the leading verbs. Weissenborn's note on the first passage is: die Absicht statt der Folge. The two first examples might be made

ordinary purpose-clauses by personifying *pestilentia*.

The word *nimis* occurs in two of these passages, and *quando*, *undique*, *prorsus* strike the same note in the other three. All the sentences alike sound the note of doom. It is fate, it is the Gods to whom '*nimietas*' is distasteful. In every case *ne* may be taken to mean *deis nolentibus ut*. We may compare the parenthetical purpose-clause for an analogous construction, but that is more detached from the sentence-structure in sequence. There was probably never a feeling of ellipsis here. It is perhaps explanation enough of the usage in question to describe it as an ironical use of the parenthetical purpose-clause.

EDWIN W. FAY.

THE PARTICLE *SIC* AS A SECONDARY PREDICATE.

THERE are many passages in Latin authors where commentators have found difficulty in explaining the meaning of the particle *sic*. They have rightly or wrongly assumed 'idiomatic' meanings which are very far removed from, and very hard to connect with, its proper signification of *hoc modo*. (Hand. Tursell. iii. 467). Moreover, if anyone will examine carefully the articles on *sic* in the dictionaries of Forcellini, Georges, Lewis and Short, White and Riddle, and the fragmentary work of Key, he must, I think, be struck by the inconsistent and unsatisfactory manner in which it has been treated.

I propose in this paper to show that in some cases at least these difficulties and inconsistencies are due to the fact that commentators and the compilers of dictionaries have failed to perceive that *sic* is sometimes used, not as a simple adverb or as a predicate with *esse*, but as a secondary predicate 'denoting the circumstances under which, or the character in which a person or thing acts or is acted upon.' (Roby, *Lat. Gram.* § 1017 c). The distinction between this use and its use predicatively with *esse* is well illustrated by Ter. Phorm. 210 seqq. *vultum contemplamini*; *en, | satin' sic est?* GE. *non. AN. quid si sic?* GE. *prope modum. AN. quid sic?* GE. *sut est. In satin' sic est* the word *sic*, 'being thus, like this,' denotes the cir-

cumstances under which his face is *satis*, 'will do,' while in *quid si sic* the word *sic* is directly predicated of *vultus* understood. With the words *quid sic* we must supply *est vultus*, and then it is seen that *sic* is again a secondary predicate 'denoting, etc.' Cf. Cic. Rosc. Am. 84 *sic est vita* with Verr. 1, 70 *sic iste . . . felicior fuit*. We must also distinguish that predicative use to which Madvig refers in his note on Cic. Fin. iv. 63, where the adverb *non tam modum ipsius actionis significat quam quid de actione iudicetur*, to which belong Propertius' *sic maestae cecinere tubae*, and expressions like *sic volo*, *sic iubeo*, *sic postulo*.

I shall now deal with some passages which illustrate the view I am advocating, but which have been differently explained by well known commentators. I shall endeavour to show that the apparent variations in the meaning of *sic* are due, not to any real change of meaning, but to a difference of relation to the other words in the various sentences. In some of these, *sic*, like other colourless terms in Latin, may require a stronger rendering in English, with a complexion derived from the context, but in all it will be seen that it literally means 'thus' or 'such,' preceded by 'being' or 'when,' as is usual with secondary predicates in English.

Plaut. Amph. 117 *huc processi sic cum servili schema*. Here *sic* clearly indicates the character in which he comes forth, and is further explained by *cum s. s.* following; it cannot possibly have any other relation to the rest of the sentence. The use of an explanatory phrase immediately following *sic* I have pointed out in my note on *sic temere*, which appeared in the *Class. Review*, April 1896, pp. 157-158.

Plaut. Cas. 704 seqq. *gladium Casinam intus habere ait qui med atque ted evitet. OL. scio. sic sine habere. nugas agunt. novi ego illas malas merces*. It may be noticed that *intus* is a secondary predicate as well as *sic*, the latter being = *talem*. For *talis* as secondary predicate cf. Ter. Eun. 160 *istum nunc times . . . ne illum talem prae-ripiat tibi*. Verg. Georg. 3, 92 *talis et ipse inbum cervice effudit equina* | *Saturnus*.

I explain *sic* similarly in Plaut. Ps. 389 *nolo his iterari : sat sic longae fiant fabulae*. Bacch. 1005 *sat sic suspectus sum, quom careo noxia*, where *quom c. n.* explains *sic*. Mil. 854 *ibi erat bilibris aula, sic propter cudos*. Ter. Hec. 283 seqq. *hacine causa ego eram tanto opere cupidus redeundi domum* | *hui* ! | *quanto fuerat praestitibus ubivis gentium agere aetatem* | *quam huc redire*, etc. PAR. *at sic citius qui te expedias his acrimnis re-perius* | *si non rediisses*, etc. Here *sic* = 'being thus,' i.e. 'being back,' i.e. 'having returned.'

Cic. Rose. Am. 71 *noluerunt feris corpus obicere ; ne bestiis quoque quae tantum scelus attigissent inhumanioribus uteremur ; non sic nudos in flumen deicere*. Halm's note is : '*sic nudos, nackt wie sie sind, in unmittelbarer nacktheit* ; Liv. ii. 10, 11 *sic armatus desiluit*.' The Clarendon Press editor translates 'naked as they were' ; Lewis and Short explain similarly under the heading 'demonstrative temporal force.' I object to these explanations because (1) they make *sic* a mere redundancy with *nudos* ; (2) 'naked as they were,' if it has any meaning at all, implies they were naked at the time, which does not appear from the context ; (3) I have no doubt that *nudos* merely means 'uncovered' as opposed to *in culleum inbutos* ; (4) it seems to me that the only way in which a satisfactory meaning can be obtained is by taking *sic* as a secondary predicate pointing to *tantum scelus*, and so = 'being such,' i.e. 'so wicked.' For this use of *sic* equivalent to an adjective suggested by a preceding substantive cf. Mart. 2, 1, 11 seqq. *esse tibi tanta cantus brevitate videris* ! | *hei mihi quam multis sic quoque longus eris* ! where *sic* = *tam brevis*. Cf. also

the passages from Lucretius and Vergil cited below. The interpretation which I suggest will be found to give additional force to Cicero's words.

Lucretius v. 436 seqq. *sed nova tempestas quaedam molesque coorta* | *omne genus de principiis discordia quorum* | *intervalla vias conexus pondera plagas* | *concursum motus turbabat proelia miscens* | *propter dissimilis formas variasque figuras* | *quod non omnia sic poterant coniuncta manere*.

Munro translated the last two lines thus : 'because by reason of their unlike forms and varied shapes they could not all remain thus joined together.' But if this be correct, what manner of joining is meant by 'thus' ? Dr. Duff in the Pitt Press edition says : '*sic* 'straight off,' 'at once,' οὐροί. Cf. 970.' Can it be shown that *sic* ever has this assumed 'idiomatic' meaning ? In line 970 *sic* is a conjectural insertion made by Munro, who explains it as = *sicut erant* or *negligenter*, quoting for that meaning sundry passages, in none of which is either of those meanings certain, or necessary. To examine these passages here would involve a too lengthy digression, but I may point out that Munro's view of Persius *sic poeta prodire* has been abandoned by Conington and Nettleship, while I have shown in the *Classical Review*, April 1896, that Horace's *sic temere* admits of a better explanation.

Lewis and Short (p. 1691^a) quote Lucr. v. 441 above for *sic* as 'a local demonstrative accompanied by a corresponding gesture.' If so, what does it mean ?

I suggest therefore that *sic* should be taken in its ordinary sense of 'thus' or 'such,' equivalent to *dissimilia formis figurisque* and standing to *omnia* in the relation of a secondary predicate 'denoting the character, etc.' Then the words *propter . . . figuras* will go with *proelia miscens*, and the last line of the passage will be translated 'because being of this kind, so unlike, they could not all remain joined together.' Thus a satisfactory meaning is obtained.

Verg. Aen. 5, 618 seqq. *fit Beroc . . . ac sic Dardanidum medium se matribus infert*. Here commentators like Sidgwick pass over the difficulty, or like Conington leave the meaning of *sic* unexplained. I suggest that it is exactly similar to *talis* in Georg. 3, 92 cited above, and is a secondary predicate = *Beroen simulans*.

Similarly Aen. 6, 680 seqq. *atque hic Aeneas ; una namque ire videbat* | *egregium forma iuvenem et fulgentibus armis* | *sed frons laeta parum et delecto lumina voltu* : *quis pater ille virum qui sic comitatur euntem* ?

Here *sic* refers to *egregium forma*, etc., *delecto lumina voltu*, and denotes the character in which the younger Marcellus accompanies the elder. This was partially perceived by Forbiger, whereas Conington's 'thus as we see' misses or evades the exact meaning of the particle.

Hor. Sat. 1, 4, 135, *hoc faciens vivam melius; sic dulcis amicis occurram*. Here *sic* stands in the same relation to *occurram* as *hoc faciens* does to *vivam*.

Ovid Met. 1, 695 seqq. *ritu quo cincta Dianae falleret, et credi posset Latonia si non corneus huic arcus si non foret aureus illi. sic quoque fallebat*. Here *sic* = *corneo arcu* and stands in the same relation to *fallebat* as *cincta* does to *falleret*. Cf. 13, 896 *sed sic quoque erat tamen Acis*, where also *sic* = 'being thus,' i.e. 'in this form.'

Sallust, Cat. 7, *sed gloriae maximum certamen inter ipsos erat; sic quisque hostem ferire properaret*. Here *sic* = *maxime certans*. The failure to perceive its true meaning accounts for the variant *se* and Gröndel's suggested *ac si*.

Propertius 2, 8, 15 seqq. *ecquandone tibi liber sum visus? an usque in nostram iacies verba superba caput? sic igitur prima moriere aetate, Properti?—sed morere; interitu gaudeat illa tuo*. Here *sic* = 'thus flouted,' *verbis superbis caput impulsus*, and thus fittingly connects vv. 17 seqq. with what has preceded (cf. Nägelsbach, *Lat. Styl.* p. 608), refuting the contention of Lachmann and Müller that a new elegy begins at v. 17.

Tacitus, Ann. 1, 34, *adistentem contionem in manipulos discedere iubet: sic melius audituros responsum*. Furneaux tr. *sic* 'as they were,' comparing Ann. 4, 40, 4 and 15, 17, 3 for this so-called idiomatic meaning. I sug-

gest that *sic* 'like this' is merely a secondary predicate, and = *adistentes*. In Ann. 4, 40, 4, (*simplicius acturum de inimicis primum Agrippinae, quas longe acrius arsuras, si matrimonium Liviae velut in partes domum Caesaris distraxisset. Sic quoque erumpere accumulationem feminarum*.) *sic* seems to mean simply 'in this manner,' viz. *distrahendo in partes domum Caesaris*. The other passage which Furneaux cites is Ann. 15, 17, 3, *quando in incerto habeantur Parthorum conatus, Suriam repetiturum; sic quoque optimam Fortunam orandam, ut pedes confectus itinerum spatium . . . equitem adsequeretur*. Here *sic* either suggests *repentem* and is a secondary predicate denoting the circumstance under which Fortune is to be addressed by Corbulo, or it may be taken as pointing to the following *ut* clause, which will then be explanatory. Cf. Cic. Or. iii. 46, *sic agam vobiscum . . . ut aliquid de vestris vitiis audiat*.

Before concluding, I must mention one more passage, Livy, 2, 10, 12, which is usually cited in support of the current explanation of Cic. Rose. Am. 71. Livy's words are: *clamore sublato undique in unum hostem tela coniciunt, . . . iam impetu conabantur detruere virum cum simul fragor rupti pontis simul clamor impetum sustinuit. tum Coeles 'Tiberine pater,' inquit, ' . . . hunc militem accipias.' Ita sic armatus in Tiberim desiluit*. Here I see no reason to doubt that *sic* points to what has gone before and = 'being thus circumstanced.' *Ita* of course means 'accordingly.' Hand. Tursell. iii. 485. Different is Quintilian 2, 21, 20 *ita sic quoque recte dicimus*, where *sic* points to what follows, 'accordingly the following is also a correct statement.'

J. STANLEY.

'NUMNE'

This form has had an interesting history. Its very existence has been both affirmed and denied. Ritschl, *Opusc.* ii. p. 248 and Hand Tursellinus iv. 79 have denied its Latinity. Neither Georges, *Lec. d. lat. Wort.-form* nor Lindsay, *Latin Lang.*, even mentions it, though the former in his *Lat. Deutsch Wörterb.* cites it for Cic. 'numne vis audire?' But where does this occur? Elmer, *Proc. Am. Phil. Assn.* 1892, p. xx. in a footnote says: 'Hand Tursellinus iv. 79 and Ritschl, *Opusc.* ii. p. 248 are probably right in

denying the Latinity of this form.' Stolz in *Handb. d. Klass. Alt. Wissenschaft* ii.² does not mention the form at all, but in the *Hist. Gram. d. lat. Spr.* p. 439, § 83 simply records it. Ribbeck, however, *Lat. Part.* p. 13 maintains that the form does occur.

The passages that have been cited for its use are three:

(1) Plautus, *Truc.* ii. 6, 65. Goetz and Schoell however have a different reading here (line 546): *tu num nevis*, etc.

(2) Cic. *N.D.* i. 31, 88.

(3) Cic. *Lael.* 11, 36.

Krebs-Schmalz, *Antib.*⁶ ii. p. 159 say: 'ist aber noch für Cicero zu halten;' cf. also Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*² § 158. Merguet, *Lex. Phil. Schr.* and Menge, *Repet. d. lat. Spr.*⁶ § 409 under 'numne' cite these passages for Cic. It is the reading of B. and K., Halm, and Mueller.

The following occurrences of this form I have not seen noted:

(1) *Afranius*, 29 (Ribbeck, *Scaen. Rom. Poes. Frag.*):

Terenti numne similem dicent quempiam?

(2) *Dec. Laberius*, 22:

Numne aliter hunc pedicabis?

(3) *Prudentius*, *Contra Sym.* i. 322:

Numne etiam caeli minor et etc.

(4) *Idem.* ii. 940:

Numne Leontini sulcator solvere etc.

(5) *Idem.* *Ham.* 871:

Numne animarum oculis denso etc.

The above five well-established occurrences of this form added to the two probable occurrences in Cicero would lead to the conclusion that a denial of its existence is no longer possible.

EMORY B. LEASE

University of Michigan.

CYPRIAN $\tilde{\iota}$ = "OR."

In *Ind. Forsch.* ii. p. 219 n. Persson suggested that this word, which is only known from the Idaliu inscription Cauer² 472, 24 $\tilde{\iota} \xi \tau \tilde{\omega} \kappa \alpha \pi \omega$, may be identical with the first syllable of $\tilde{\iota} \delta \epsilon$. But Hoffmann, *Gr. Diall.* i. p. 163, noticing that $\tilde{\eta}$ only appears in this inscription before consonants, and comparing the change in the dialect of Idaliu of $\tilde{\epsilon}$ to $\tilde{\iota}$ before a or o, supposes a similar change of $\tilde{\epsilon}$ to $\tilde{\iota}$ before a word beginning with an initial vowel. But perhaps as in Cretan, which

sometimes shows $\mu \acute{\epsilon}$ for $\mu \tilde{\eta}$ before vowels only, though $\mu \tilde{\eta}$ before both consonants and vowels (*vide* Schulze, *K.Z.* xxiii p. 133 *seq.*), so in this dialect $\tilde{\eta}$ was shortened before initial vowels, and then passed into $\tilde{\iota}$.

Could the reading $\tilde{\omega} \varsigma \tilde{\iota} \tilde{\alpha} \pi \alpha \sigma \alpha$ X 410 be referred in its origin to a similar shortening of $\tilde{\epsilon}$ before vowels, $\tilde{\iota}$ being first graphic representation of $\tilde{\epsilon}$, and then changed by grammarians to $\tilde{\iota}$?

C. M. MULVANY.

EMENDATIONS OF PLATO, *REPUBLIC* IX. 580 D AND III. 390 A.

THE usually accepted reading in Plato, *Rep.* ix. 580 D is $\epsilon \tilde{\iota} \nu \delta \eta$, $\epsilon \tilde{\iota} \pi \omega \nu$ αὐτῇ μὲν ἡμῶν ἢ ἀποδείξαι μία ἂν εἴη δευτέραν δὲ δὲ $\tilde{\iota} \delta \epsilon$ τῇδε, εἰάν τι δόξη, εἶναι. Τίς αὐτῇ;

The words δὲ δὲ are admitted on the authority of Ξ, q, and other late MSS.: δὲ δὲ is the reading of the two best authorities, A and II. It has not, so far as I can discover, been hitherto pointed out that δὲ δὲ is a mere orthographical slip for δὲ $\tilde{\iota} \delta \epsilon$. We should read δευτέραν δὲ $\tilde{\iota} \delta \epsilon$ τῇδε, εἰάν τι δόξη εἶναι. As soon as δὲ $\tilde{\iota} \delta \epsilon$ was written δὲ δὲ, the transposition δὲ δὲ was an obvious, though unsatisfactory, remedy.

Another curious slip has crept into the text of all the MSS. in iii. 390 A τί δέ; ποιεῖν ἄνδρα τὸν σοφώτατον λέγοντα, ὡς δοκεῖ αὐτῷ κάλλιστον εἶναι πάντων, ὅταν παραπλείαι ὥσι τράπεζαι

σίτον καὶ κρεῖων, μέθην δ' ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων οἰνόχοος φορέησι καὶ ἐγχείη δεπάεσαι.

All the MSS. (with one exception) read παραπλείαι or παραπλείαι. The word is ex-

plained by L. and S. to mean 'almost full.' But surely—not to mention the strange use of παρά—this involves a ridiculous bathos. Why should Odysseus have said it was the most beautiful thing in the world (κάλλιστον πάντων) when the tables are nearly full of bread and meat? Surely it is an even more beautiful spectacle when they are quite full! A reference to the original in Homer *Odyssey* ix. 8 παρά δὲ πληθῶσι τράπεζαι shews that we should read

παρὰ πλείαι ὥσι τράπεζαι
σίτου καὶ κρεῖων κ.τ.λ.,

or else, if we cannot allow the ι in πλείαι to be treated for purposes of scansion as a γ , then

παρὰ πλείαι ὥσι τράπεζαι κ.τ.λ.

Plato's Homer must have read

παρὰ δὲ πλείαι (πλείαι) ὥσι τράπεζαι,

or else the variant is due to Plato himself.

This correction is perhaps to a slight extent confirmed by the accentuation of one MS.—Cesenas M.¹ In this MS. the word is written

¹ I owe my knowledge of this MS. to Prof. Campbell, who has kindly lent me Rostagno's collation.

παράλειαι (*sic*), with ε above α and ι above á added by a later hand. But it seems to me more probable that the two accents come from two different hands.

J. ADAM.

NOTES ON SOME PASSAGES IN CICERO'S LETTERS *AD FAMILIARES*.

III. 4 § 1: illo libro augurali quem ad me amantissime scriptum suauissimum misisti. The epithet *suauissimum* is tacked on in a manner unlike that of Cicero. Some word such as *donum* or *munus* seems to have fallen out after *scriptum*.

I. 7 § 3: cui quidem (Pompeio) litterae tuae quas proxime miseras, quod facile intellexerim, periucundae fuerunt. The subjunctive *intellexerim* has caused trouble and has often been suspected. Draeger § 488 classes it as limitative; it is rather 'potential,' like the ordinary *crediderim*, the sense of the words *quod facile i.* being 'as I would gladly incline to suppose.' Compare *Att.* II. 22 § 6 quod facile sentias; also *Fam.* XIII. 29 § 7 hoc mihi uelim credas: si quid fecerim hoc ipso in bello minus ex Caesaris uoluntate, quod intellexerim scire ipsum Caesarem me inuitissimum fecisse. . . . In this latter passage Madvig and Boot read *intellexi*, while Prof. Tyrrell thinks that the mood of *intellexerim* is due to that of *fecerim*. But the subjunctive seems on a par with that in I. 7 § 3; and I have often suspected that *facile* has dropped out in front of it.

IV. 15 § 2: tamen etsi antea scripsi, quae existimaui scribi oportere, tamen hoc tempore breuiter commonendum putauī. . . . Some editors (including C. F. W. Müller) insert *te* before *tempore*; but this is surely unnecessary. For *commonere aliquid* 'to convey a warning,' is a good enough expression.

VI. 6 § 2: cum me ex re publica expulsi- sent ei qui illam cadere posse stante me non putarunt. . . . It is very difficult to understand why *putarunt* should have been treated (almost universally) as corrupt. There is no reason why *putarunt* should not be referred to the thoughts which the writer's opponents had at the moment of his expulsion. If for any reason this should be deemed unsatisfactory, it is easy to find passages where *non putauī* is the equivalent of *numquam putauī*.

VIII. 3 § 1: maxime uero ut te dies noctesque quaeram, competitor Hirrus curat.

quo modo illum putas auguratus tuum competitorum dolere et dissimulare me certiore quam se candidatum? de quo ut, quem optas, quam primum nuntium accipias, tua me dius fidius magis quam mea causa cupio. nam mea, si fio si forsitan cum locupletiore referam. Very many have been the emendations of the last sentence. I would propose one which seems to me to depart less widely from the MSS. readings, and at the same time to fit in better with the context than any correction I have seen. It is this: *nam meā, si fio, forsitan cum locupletiore rēferat* (*sc. fieri*). Caelius says that it is for the sake of Cicero and not for his own sake that he desires Hirrus to fail; so far as his own interest is concerned, it would possibly be of advantage to be elected along with a man richer than himself.

VIII. 9 § 1: post repulsam risus facit ciuem bonum ludit et contra Caesarem sententias dicit; expectationem corripit; Curionem prorsus Curionem non mediocriter obiurgatus ac repulsa se mutauit.

Much has been written also about this passage. The words *expectationem corripit* are rightly maintained and interpreted by Mendelssohn. Every emendation of the succeeding words which I have seen rejects the second *Curionem*. I would suggest, as the original reading, Curionem prorsus e Curione...obiurgat: 'he reviles Curio quite in Curio's own style.' C. F. W. Müller ends the sentence with *totus hac repulsa se mutauit*, (after Riemann). It seems to me more likely that *ac* is an error for *sic* (Madvig) or perhaps *ita* which might easily pass to *ac* through *et*.

VIII. 15 § 4: sed tamen quod ob scelus iter mihi necessarium retro ad Alpīs uersus incidit? Adeo quod Intimellii in armis sunt.

Adeo has been often changed to *ideo*. Mendelssohn keeps the word, relying on a reference to Landgraf's note 298 to Reisig. No real parallel, however, is there produced. If we suppose that *id* has fallen out before *adeo*, as it easily would after the

final letters of *incidit*, the usage becomes normal. After *id* or other pronoun, *adeo* is often little more than an emphasising particle. *Id* would refer back to *quod ob scelus*.

VIII. 17 § 2: uos inuitos uincere coegero. arant anum me Catonem.

The last words have been variously emended, always (so far as I have seen) in such a way as to depart considerably from the letters in the MSS. I would add one letter and alter another and propose *narrant anus me Catonem* 'the old ladies babble of me as a very Cato.' The flippancy of the remark suits well the character of the writer, and an assertion that he is regarded as a second Cato suits well the context. I was led to this suggestion by a passage in *Att.* XVI. 1 § 6 where the scapegrace young Quintus Cicero announces himself to his uncle as a reformed character and 'pollicetur se Catonem,' 'undertakes to be a very Cato.' In XV. 29 § 2 the uncle appears to compare the youth to Favonius, 'Cato's ape,' but the words are obscure. Cato figures as a standard of uprightness in XVI. 7 § 4: ergo id erat meum factum quod Catoni probare non possem? flagiti scilicet plenum et dedecoris: utinam a primo ita tibi esset uisum! tu mihi, sicut esse soles, fuisses Cato.

XIII. 69 § 1: haec ad te eo pluribus scripsi ut intellegeres me non uulgare nec ambitiose, sed ut pro homine intimo ac mihi pernecessario scribere.

The corrections of this passage aim at getting rid of *uulgare*, by reading *uulgari more* or the like, but leave *ambitiose scribere* untouched. The phrase is really meaningless. How can *ambitiose scribere* apply to a letter of introduction? I would read, by the slightest of changes, *uulgari nec ambitioso*. These words form a contrast with *intimo ac pernecessario*. The idiom *scribere alicui* with the sense 'to write with reference to some one' is pretty common. To the instances I have quoted in a note on Cic. *Academ.* I. § 8 may be added *Ad Qu. Fratrem* III. 1 § 11; *De Orat.* II. § 341; *Sen. Suas.* II. § 19; *Plin. N.H.* XVIII. § 24; *Avian. Fab.* I. 16; *Ovid. Trist.* II. 245 and 303; *Pont.* III. 351; *Martial* Pref. to I. Similar datives are found

with other verbs which might take a dative of a different kind; so Cic. *Sest.* § 32 *ceteris supplicare*. The dative *bono* is of the same sort in *Sest.* § 110 *cui umquam bene dixit bono?* [This is the only passage in Cic. where *bene dicere* occurs]. *Ovid. Trist.* V. 7, 27 *nil equidem feci—tu scis hoc ipse—theatris*, seems correct though the reading has been disputed; see Mr. Owen's note in his Appendix. For *uulgaris* applied to a person cf. *Ad Qu. Fratrem*. II. 11 § 4 *Callisthenes uulgare negotium*. I do not understand the suggestion of C. F. W. Müller, to read *uolgarie*.

XV. 2 § 6: amicos in patris eius atque ani iudicio probatos. The *in* has been generally struck out; but it may be right if Cicero was thinking of some very formal expression of opinion. For parallels to *probari in* see my note on Cic. *Academ.* II. § 75.

XVI. 23 § 1: Antonius de lege quid egerit—liceat modo rusticari. Lehmann in his work on the letters to Atticus, brilliantly proposes 'quod egerit,' an elliptical proverbial phrase 'anything he pleases' (i.e. I will put up with) and establishes the idiom by parallels. Mendelssohn commends the conjecture, though he does not print it in his text; it is printed by C. F. W. Müller and by Messrs. Tyrrell and Purser. But the next words, *liceat modo rusticari*, incline me to think that *quid* is an error for *quidlibet*. The sentence seems to have been of the same type as *Phil.* II. § 84 *quidlibet, modo ne nauset, faciat*; *Acad.* II. § 132 *quem libet, modo aliquem*; *pro Quinct.* § 97; *Tusc.* 4, 45 and 55; *Att.* XVI. 2 § 3; *Ovid. Pont.* I. 1, 44. Cf. also *Mart.* IX. 46 (of a man with a mania for building): *nunc has, nunc illas reficit mutatque fenestras. | Dum tantum aedificet, quidlibet ille facit; oranti nummos ut etc.* So I have no doubt the passage should be punctuated; Friedländer puts a comma at *fenestras*, a full stop at *aedificet*, and a comma again at *facit*. So in *Ad Att.* XV. 20 § 1: *Dolabellae mandata sint quaelibet, mihi aliquid, the word mihi seems to be* an error for *modo*, the contractions *m* and *m* having been confused.

J. S. REID.

ORATOR = PETITIONER, SUPPLIANT.

THE lexicographers are probably wrong in limiting this meaning of *orator* to Plautus and ecclesiastical Latin (Lewis and Short give it only as Plautine). In *Ter. Hec.* 9,

Orator ad vos venio ornatu prologi, modern editors have followed Donatus in taking *orator* = ambassador; but the idea of petition is clearly predominant, as is shown by the

following *Sinite exorator sim.* Cf. *Prol. Amph.* 34, *Nam iusta ab iustis iustus sum orator datus*, and *passim*, where again the *Prologus* (Mercury) has a request to make of the audience. In the only other instance of the use of the word by Terence, *Heaut.* 11, *Oratorem esse voluit me, non prologum*, the same signification is probable; cf. 26 *infra*, *qua re omnis vos oratos volo*. The close connection in this passage with *actorem* (12) and *orationem* (15) makes it possible to understand *orator* here in a slightly different sense—not ‘ambassador,’ however, but ‘advocate.’

Festus thus understood *Hec.* 9 and Afranius 92, and explained the use as *pro deprecatoribus*; cf. with this explanation *Cic. Imp. Pomp.* 12, 35, *legatos deprecatoresque misissent*. Even in the use of the word of an embassy, it is to be noted that it is used not so much with reference to the spokesman or the fact that the message is oral, as because the ambassador is a petitioner. This is no less true that his petition is in behalf of another. Accordingly, we find regularly

mention of the thing for which he is to treat. Cf. *Enn. Ann.* 211, *orator sine pace redit*; *Liv.* 1, 15, 5, *Veientes pacem petitem oratores Romam mittunt*; *Verg. Aen.* 11, 100, *Iamque oratores alevant...veniamque rogantes*; *Plaut. Poen.* 357, the command *exora* and the retort *sed vide sis, ne tu oratorem hunc pugnis pectas postea*; *Stich.* 494-5, *Haut aequomst te inter oratores accipi*, of the ambassadors, and the retort *Equidem hercle orator sum, sed procedit parum*, of the parasite begging for a dinner.

An overwhelming number of like passages might be cited to prove that *orator* was commonly used of the ambassador as petitioner or intercessor, even in the face of the testimony of *Servius* (*Verg. Aen.* 11, 100), of Festus (p. 198 Müll., *Orare antiquos dixisse pro agere testimonio est, quod oratores dicti et causarum actores et qui reipublicae mandatas causas agebant*), and even of *Varro* (*L.L.* 6, 13, *quia verba facit apud eum ad quem legatur*).

J. C. KIRTLAND, JUNR.

Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.

NOTE ON TER. AD. 223-4.

THE MS. reading *quasi iam usquam tibi sint viginti minae, Dum huic obsequare* has been generally suspected and variously amended. The majority of editors, accepting the explanation of Donatus (*Quasi numero in aliquo ducas et in aliqua aestimatione constituas: et non, si velis, penitus contemnas viginti minas, dum modo huic obsequaris*), have seen in the supposed abnormal use of *usquam* the only objection to this understanding of the passage. The only parallel that has been cited for this use is found in *Eun.* 293, *Neque virgost usquam neque ego*, but here the local force with which the word is first introduced is the warrant, as it affords the opportunity for the turn. Negative adverbs of place, however, and equivalent adverbial expressions are not uncommon in this signification, e.g. *nullo loco, οὐδαμῶς*.

There may well be, then, two ways of thinking with regard to the objection urged on the score of usage against the traditional interpretation of this passage, but as to the strength of the position taken by Dziatzko against the logical inconsequence of that interpretation there can be no question. Sannio is to be made to feel that he is in great danger of suffering a total loss; there

is no longer any thought of reassuring him, and with *age novi tuum animum* the work of intimidating him begins. *quasi...obsequare* is plainly a threat, and another is conveyed by implication in *praeterea...Cyprum*. It is strange that with this definite notion of the meaning to be conveyed and with but the single word *obsequare* not making for that meaning, Dziatzko should have been unable to hit upon a satisfactory emendation.

Is not the passage as it stands capable of interpretation as he would have it interpreted? The effect sought for may be obtained as well by making *dum...obsequare* refer to the future as by substituting a word that will represent the actual present state of affairs. In other words, we have a clause denoting time ‘contemporaneous in limit,’ and not a proviso, as we have supposed it on the authority of Donatus; and the subjunctive is anticipatory or due to subordination to *sint*.

Syrus has taken upon himself the task of persuading Sannio that he will do well to accept what the girl cost him, and he accomplishes his purpose by threatening the procurer with the loss even of this, and by letting him see that his intended departure for

Cyprus is known and has been counted upon to make him more complaisant. 'As if you were at all sure of the twenty minae (as if you would ever get the twenty minae) until you come to terms with Aeschinus. And

besides, it is currently reported that you are on the point of departure for Cyprus.'

J. C. KIRTLAND, JUNR.

Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.

RIESE'S ANTHOLOGIA LATINA.

Anthologia Latina. Ediderunt FRANCISCUS BUECHELER et ALEXANDER RIESE. Teubner 1894-7. M. 17. 70.

WE have here a second edition of the first portion of Riese's *Anthologia Latina*, followed by a gathering which Buecheler has made of the metrical inscriptions, thus accomplishing for Latin what Kaibel has done for Greek. The labour expended on the work has been vast; to praise it would be almost impertinent; to criticise it, or even to convey any adequate idea of it, within the narrow limits of a review, is impossible. It will be an indispensable adjunct to any first-hand study of Latin. In whatever portion of the field a scholar may be toiling, he will find matter for consideration in these volumes. The co-operation of many scholars for a long time to come, will be needed in order to arrive at a full understanding of these *carmina*. Every practised Latinist who reads them with attention may expect to solve some difficulties which have baffled others. Buecheler has achieved his task as no other living man could have achieved it. But much remains to be done, and the words of Aristotle apply: *δόξει ἂν παντὸς εἶναι προαγαγεῖν καὶ διαρθρῶσαι τὰ καλῶς ἔχοντα τῇ περιγραφῇ*. There is indeed much that is fatiguing, even repulsive to read in these *carmina*, but he who perseveres will be amply repaid.

Riese has given full consideration to the criticisms of the poems contained in the *Anthologia* which have appeared since the date of his first edition. Naturally, the influence of Baehrens has been great, perhaps too great. It is much to be regretted that the editor has not given references to the journals or works in which the criticisms quoted by him have been published. This would have cost him little labour, and the reader who wishes to hunt up the original articles must waste time hugely for want of clues. Also, the abbreviations used are not clearly set forth. Those who read the volume for the first time will often be puz-

zled by them. And it is a pity that the passages of classical writers imitated by these late poets have been so very rarely noted. Buecheler supplies far more help of the kind. The text of the verses is on the whole very corrupt, and there is still a wide field for criticism. I append comments on a few passages, quoting the poems by the numbers which Riese gives them.

11, ll. 64, 5. The poet compares Hippodamia, who is standing close by her father and Pelops, to a precious stone set in gold:

qualis gemma micat, fuluum quae diuidit
aurum,
inter utramque uiam talem se laeta ferebat.

The words *utramque uiam* must surely have been corrupted from *utrumque uirum*. The codex Salmasianus indeed gives *utrumque*.

21, ll. 204, 210:

hoc sapiens Furia, Venus inuida, Iuno
cruenta.....
quod furor exposcit demens, quod praelia
saeua.

The whole piece is curious; it is a versification of a rhetorical controversy, of the kind with which we are familiar from the rhetorician Seneca and the pseudo-Quintilian. In the lines quoted *hoc* and *quod* refer to *aurum*. In the first of the two lines I would read *saeuiens* for *sapiens* and in the second *demensque in praelia saeuit*. The writer is much given to repeating himself, and l. 210 echoed l. 204. As to the scansion of *saeuiens* as a spondee, it hardly calls for illustration in so late a writer. But I would refer to Lucetius 5,396, a line which both in A and in B runs thus:

ignis enim superauit et ambens multa per-
ussit;

but B has the correction *lambens*, which Lachmann adopted, changing *superauit* to

superāt; wherein he has been followed by subsequent editors. Of the reading *ambiens*, in older editions, Lachmann only says that the verse does not permit it. The metrical question, I am convinced, ought not to be dismissed in so summary a fashion; but to debate it here would take me too far afield. The reading *ambiens* receives support from passages in two imitators of Lucretius, who employ *ambire* in connexion with fire: Arnobius 2, 30 (a chapter in which there is much reminiscence of Lucretius) *licet omnibus ambiatur flammis torrentium fluminum*; and Minucius Felix, *Oct.* 35, 1 *ambientis ardoris*. In Buecheler's collection, no. 197 (*C. I. L.* viii. 1070) we have

ita leuis incumbat terra denuncio tibi . . .
rogo ne sepulcri umbras uiolare audeas.

Buecheler corrects *denuncio* to *defuncto*. But the scansion of *denuncio* is similar to that of *saeuiens*, (cf. *acquiesceret* in 165, l. 3) and *ita* is explained by the *ne*-clause, while *incumbat* is directly dependent on *denuncio*.
198, ll. 59, 60:

aufer, iners monitor, turpis fomenta medellae.

The subject of the poem is 'Achilles in parthenone,' when he hears the trumpet of Diomedes. He imagines a speech by a bad adviser who warns him against going to Troy, and he replies in the words quoted. But what is the meaning of *turpis medellae*? The word *medellae* appears to derive from an original *medullae*.

276, ll. 3, 4:

inuidia excelsos, inopes iniuria uexat:
quam felix uiuit quisquis utroque caret!

Riese, with Lessing, alters *utroque* to *utraque*, quite unnecessarily. All Latin neuter pronouns used substantivally may have reference to nouns of any number or gender. This use is especially common in the case of the phrases *in eo*, *in quo*, *in utroque*, where the reference is often to feminine nouns; but editors frequently emend without cause. So in *Cic. Off.* 2, 52 *in utroque* in a good many texts is changed to *in utraque*.

291, ll. 7, 8:

sic famem gestu loquaci et mitiori uertice
disceit ille quam sit aptum uentris arte uincere.

Riese puts an obelus before *uertice*, and says *non intellegitur*. The subject is a tame fish, which like the fish of Hortensius and Lucullus, 'postulat cibos diurnos ore piscis paruolo | nec manum fugit uocatus nec pauescit retia.' It apparently makes gestures with its mouth or head when it is hungry. Seemingly *mitiori* should be changed to *mutiori*, which gives a contrast with *loquaci*. The word *arte* is also corrupt. Read *uentris arta*, 'the straits of hunger'; thus *famem gestu loquaci uincere* and *mutiori uertice uentris arta uincere* exactly correspond.

376, ll. 7, 8:

uirtus forma decus animus sensusque uiril,
inuigilans animo sollers super omnia sensus.

The lines occur in an eulogy upon Thrasamundus, king of Libya. Riese obelizes *sensus*. But the very structure of the two lines shows the word to be correct; the second line is intended to repeat *sensus* from the first, as well as *animus*. The meaning 'good judgment,' 'good sense,' is satisfactory enough. The word is thus eulogistically employed on sepulchral inscriptions, as in 29 and 81 of the 'carmina epigraphica.'

Buecheler's collection opens with the song of the Arval brethren. If an account were written of the proposals for change in the text of this hymn, which have been made by eminent scholars, it would have a curious interest and would enforce, by sheer repulsion, a lesson in sobriety. Buecheler's treatment of it is eminently conservative. He considers that the famous inscription in which, in rough Saturnians, Mummius celebrates the capture of Corinth, is not the original, but a copy made at a comparatively late date. In the epitaph of the 'filios Barbati,' the addition of *uiro* at the end of the second line ('duonoro optumo fuisse uiro') is decisively rejected, and also the addition of *claud* at the end of the fifth line, formerly proposed by the editor. As regards the inscription in honour of Scipio Barbatus himself, the view of Ritschl and Mommsen is accepted, that it is not older than the time of the son: 'patri post filii mortem hoc elogium obtigisse quo parem cum filio honorem haberet.' Hazardous as it is to run in any way counter to the opinion of such a trio, I venture to think that the theory of concoction ab initio is improbable for so early a time. The features of the inscription may be accounted for by supposing that, according to the earliest fashion, it was painted on the stone

in red, and only incised at a later date. The editor says of *Loucanam* in the last line: 'Lucana omisso terrae uocabulo pro Lucania singulare.' Is it any stranger than *continens*, *Celtica* and many other things of the kind?

63, l. 6:

nomen si quaeras, exoraturi Saluiae.

For *exoraturi* is substituted *exoritur*, an unlikely word, it seems to me. Read *exoratur*, and for *exorare aliquid* 'to obtain something in answer to an appeal,' compare Propert. 5, 5, 19.

106, l. 1:

uixi beatus dis, amicis, literis.

Rather read *uixi beatus, dis amicis, literis*. The deceased was *θεοφιλής*, and ascribes to that fact his success in literature.

207: Sabinus praetor magna res formis perit. The words *magna res* recall *ἰσοκράτους, μέγα πρᾶγμα, μαθητής*, and like usages; cf. 1109 'corpore in exiguo res numerosa fui.' Buecheler, I think (the note is a little obscure) construes *formis* with *magna res*, and supposes the praetor to be described as 'powerful in formulae.' This is hardly possible, and we are driven back on the very natural supposition of Gatti that *formis* = *Formiis*.

363: Somnio praemonitus miles hanc ponere iussit aram. The editor says 'poetae licuit somno scribere.' But if MSS. are to be trusted there are many passages in prose writers where *somnus* has the sense of *somnium*.

479: Fata me rapuere mea et me iacio eidus ignotis. Mommsen and others have thought *eidus* corrupt; but Buecheler brilliantly suggests that it is *εἰδώς*, quoting Homer's *ἴνα εἰδότες ἦ κε θάνομεν ἦ*... A fair number of instances may be collected from

inscriptions of Greek words thus embedded in Latin; so in 1109 *epoi* = *ἐπεί*.

1252 n.: The reference to Cic. *Chent.* should be 40 not 48.

1273:

ille ego qui uarios cursus uariumque laborem sustinui ut iustas conciliaret opes.

The curious syntax (*conciliaret* for *conciliarem*) may be illustrated from inscriptions, as *C. I. L.* xiv. 2485.

1362, l. 6: hoc quoque non uellet mors licuisse sibi. So Martial 4, 44, 8 nec superi uellent hoc licuisse sibi. There are some other echoes of Martial and a good many of other authors, to which reference is not made in the notes.

1409, l. 4: cui pietas fidei gratia comis erat. I do not comprehend the note 'propter fidem comis.' Seemingly *pietas fidei* (the Christian faith) go together, *pietas* and *gratia* both being subjects to *erat*.

1552, l. 30:

Aegyptos Phariis leuitatibus, artibus actis Gallia semper ouans.

Buecheler speaks of the great difficulty of *artibus actis*, and after rejecting other explanations, decides that *actis* agrees with *artibus*, *agere artes* being quite possible in the African Latin. It would be better to assume asyndeton and to suppose the words to stand for *artibus et actis*. But I suspect error here. It may be that either the stone-cutter or the transcriber of the inscription should have made the words run *actibus artis* 'the achievements of her art' i.e. the art rhetorical, which was the special glory of Gaul. The date of the inscription (second century) accords well with this supposition.

J. S. REID.

VAN LEEUWEN'S *RANAE*.

Aristophanis Ranae, cum prolegomenis et commentariis, edidit J. F. VAN LEEUWEN, in Academ. Lugduno-Batava Prof. Ord., *Lugduni Batavorum*, apud A. W. Sijthoff, 1896. M. 6.

This is the third play of Aristophanes which van Leeuwen has edited. The notes to his *Acharnians* (1885) are written in Dutch, but

in his edition of the *Vespae* (1893) and in the present volume on the *Ranae* he has appealed to a wider audience by writing Prolegomena and notes in Latin—in Latin which, though at times somewhat fearlessly un-Ciceronian in vocabulary, is always unpedantic and pleasant to read.

The Introduction (pp. i-xx) deals in the main with the argument and composition of

the play. Van Leeuwen believes that the news of the death of Euripides early in 406 suggested to Aristophanes as an argument for a comedy the meeting in Hades between Aeschylus the *μαρathonομήχης* and the sophistical Euripides and their subsequent contest before Pluto for the primacy of the dramatic art. While the poet was writing a comedy on these lines the death of Sophocles occurred towards the end of 406. 'Sensit tunc comicus eam quam ducebat telam non revellendam quidem sibi esse sed tamen ex parte retexendam (p. vi).' Consequently he remodelled his original scheme by introducing the journey of Dionysus to Hades in search of a good poet. 'Magna autem dexteritate duo haec themata, quorum alterum est: "quis poeta tragicus apud inferos primas feret," alterum: "quis in lucem reducetur," ita coniunxit et permiscuit, ut lector non nimis accurate attendens nullos in fabulae compositione deprehendat rimas (p. viii).' This is an interesting though necessarily unverifiable hypothesis.

The theory first proposed by Stanger in 1870 that there were two editions of the play has not found many adherents. The prose *ὑπόθεσις* states that the play was acted a second time because the parabasis was admired. Van Leeuwen sensibly remarks that this statement is fatal to any theory of two editions. 'Corriguntur—διασκευάζονται—fabulae quibus poeta repulsam tulit: quae vero reposcitur comoedia sine mutationibus scenae denuo est committenda (p. viii).' A verse here and there or perhaps a short passage¹ may have been altered, but the play must have remained substantially the same.

The *Adnotatio critica* is the least valuable part of van Leeuwen's otherwise valuable edition. It is to be regretted that he gives no discussion of the relation which the MSS. bear to one another, but this evidently does not enter into the plan of his work. It is still more to be regretted that he follows (to all appearances) the antiquated collations of Bekker. Why this should be I do not know, as he gives no reasons for impugning the accuracy of the more recent collations given by von Velsen in his edition of 1881. I append a list of the discrepancies which I have noted,—von Velsen's report of the Ravennas being in each case confirmed by a collation of that MS. in my possession:

Cf. Tucker's plausible explanation of the difficulties in 1435 sq. in the July number of this Review. VL's suggestion that part of this passage is interpolated from the *Demi* of Eupolis seems to me very farfetched.

57 'ἀτταταί (ἀτταράτ pauci) codd.' R reads ἀππαται, V αππαταί.

245 'πολυκολύμβους codices.' R, V and *Suidas* read πολυκολύμβουσι.

286 '(ε)ῶστω] 'στ' alii, om. V, R alii.' R reads 'στω.

488 'γ'αὐτ' R.' V also reads γ'αὐτ'.

748 'ἀπίγς Kuster] ἀπῆς codd.' R reads ἀπίγς.

844 'θερμήνη(ι) M.' If M = *Ambrosianus* L. 39 (VL gives no list of the sigla he employs) von Velsen gives its reading as θερμήνης.

889 'θεοί VA.] V reads θεοίς.

911 'τιν' ἄν Dobree] τινα codd.' V reads τιν' ἄν.

1182 'εὐδαίμων] εὐτυχής VR.' R reads εὐδαίμων.

1448 'σωθείμεν V.] V reads σωθείμεν. Some of these inaccuracies are not due to Bekker.

The text is divided into acts and scenes, and stage directions, often very happily conceived, are supplied. Conjectures are freely admitted, and the evidence of ISS has been followed in such forms as *ἀνύτω*, *ἀνύσας*, *Ταθράσιαι* (477). Crasis is nearly everywhere avoided. In this I do not quite grasp the principle that van Leeuwen has followed. In 80 he prints καὶ ἄλλως, but in 1060 κάλλως (as in *Vespae* 1357), in 34 ἡτᾶν. I do not see that there is much to be gained by the omission, since according to Meisterhans,² p. 56, the evidence of ISS is pretty evenly balanced. The *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* is very conveniently marked where it occurs, e.g. εἰς Μακ...ἄρον εὐωχίαν. I subjoin a few criticisms upon the notes:—

103 σὺ δὲ τῶντ' ἀρέσκει codd. VL suggests σοὶ ταῦτ' on the ground that this is the only clear instance of ἀρέσκω with acc. in Aristophanes. All other apparent instances contain an elided μ', which is not an accusative but a dative. It may be historically correct that ταῦτά μ' ἀρέσκει originally meant ταῦτά μοι ἀρέσκει, but it must soon have been taken for an acc., and the phrase may have formed the starting point for the construction with the acc. which is so frequent in Plato and Thuc.

108–115. VL punctuates μύμησιν and Κέρβερον. in place of the usual commas. Surely this speech of Dionysus is of the nature of what we should call 'patter,' i.e. it was delivered in one breath, winding up with the long catalogue which flabbergasts Hercules and makes him reply ὦ σφέλιε.

168 τῶν ἐκφερομένων ὅστις ἐπὶ τοῦτ' ἔρχεται. I do not feel sure that this verse is interpolated. I certainly mistrust the reason

given by VL, 'arguit enim interpolatorem verbum ἔρχεται quod Attice non *il* sed *venit* significat.' It surely means *ire* in *Ran.* 301, ἴθ' ἥπερ ἔρχεται and in *Thesm.* 485 εἰς τὸν κοπρῶν' οὖν ἔρχομαι. βάδιζέ νυν.

169 *D.* εὖν δὲ μὴ εὖρω. *X.* τότ' ἐμ' ἄγειν.

VL adopts Ritschl's ἔχειν for ἄγειν. I see no reason why the MS. reading should not be kept and translated, 'Then take me' ?—cf. 190 δοῦλον οὐκ ἄγω.

170 ἔκβαν'...ἀπόδος τὸν ναῦλον.

VL adopts Halbertsma's ἀποδοῦς. I find more humour in the passage if the MS. reading is kept. Dionysus lands and attempts to move away without paying his fare. Charon shouts after him ἀπόδος τὸν ναῦλον !

301a VL gives to Dionysus instead of to Xanthias. In this suggestion he has been anticipated by Piccolomini, *Studi FG* 1882. The change seems to improve the passage.

308 ὁδὶ δὲ δέσας ὑπερεπυρρίσσε σοῦ. Bakhuizen's explanation that ὁδὶ = ὁ πρωκτός, and that Dionysus κατατλάει ἑαυτὸν, seems right. The slave lifts up the κροκωτός. VL extends this by making ὁδὶ = ὁ κροκωτός. My only objection to this is that it must have been somewhat difficult to represent the event on the stage in so graphic a manner.

369 τοῖτοισ ἀιδῶ < the reading of *Aulus Gellius*. ἀπανδῶ codd. > καθὶς ἀπανδῶ καὶ τὸ τρίτον μάλ' ἀπανδῶ ἐξίστασθαι μύσταισι χοροῖς.

VL adopts Blaydes' πρωιδῶ in place of the thrice repeated ἀπανδῶ. But surely the more regular construction ἀπανδῶ μὴ is not grossly violated here, owing to the implied negative in ἐξίστασθαι, ἀπανδῶ ἐξίστασθαι = ἀπανδῶ μὴ ἐφίστασθαι.

593 VL reads ἀναεῖζεν < σοβαρὸν ὄντα >. The ὄντα sounds very weak, and is not much better than Meineke's < πρὸς τὸ σοβαρὸν >.

609 *Aeac.* εἰέν, καὶ μάχει ;
ὁ Διτύλας χῶ Σκεβλύας χῶ Παρδόκας
χωρεῖτε δευρὶ καὶ μάχεσθε τανυφί.

VL adopts Naber's λῖβεσθε ταντονί for μάχεσθε τανυφί to the detriment of the passage. μάχεσθε forcibly echoes the preceding μάχει, 'You mean to show fight, do you ? Here, Ditylas, etc., come and show the fellow how to fight.'

655 *Aeac.* ἐπεὶ προτιμᾶς γ' οὐδέν ; *Dion.* οὐδέν μοι μέλει.

Aeac. βαδιστόν τάρ' ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τονδὶ πάλιν.

VL says 'particula ἐπεὶ huic loco vix apta ...An εἴτ' οὐ προτιμᾶς οὐδέν ; The passage does not require the knife, but only an alteration in the punctuation. *Aeacus'* speech is really continuous: ἐπεὶ προτ. γ' οὐδέν—<Dionysus (interrupting), οὐδέν μοι μέλει>—βαδιστόν τάρ' ἐστὶν κτέ.

839 VL's suggestion, ἀπορολάλητον for ἀπερι. has been anticipated by Ribbeck, *Rh. M.* 1894.

1119 βιβλίον τ' ἔχων ἑκαστος
μανθάνει τὰ δεξιὰ.

VL thinks these lines refer to the second representation of the play, 'cum primo acta est fabula fuere inter spectatores...qui nimis doctam esse quererentur, intellectu enim difficile esse locos crebros ubi ad varias Aeschylī et Euripidis tragoedias alludetur.' So at this second performance they solemnly provided themselves with hand-books to the play, in which they could look up the references to the passages parodied. I give the Athenians credit for more humour. It must have been as bad as looking up the references in Eber's novels. Why should the passage be more than (as it is usually interpreted) a compliment to the increased education of the Athenians owing to the increase in books about this time? We are always hearing of Euripides' library. 'Every body has his book' was a phrase something like our 'the schoolmaster is abroad.'

The book is well printed—the type used in the introduction is especially pleasing—and contains few misprints. A list of the few I have noticed may be useful for a second edition :—

P. 5, last line of metrical ὑπόθεσις, read *Εὐριπίδην* ; line 51 (note) ἐστιώμεθα ; l. 308 (note) inficete ; l. 607 (note) οὐκ ἐς κόρακας ἀποφθερεῖτον seems doubtful Greek ; l. 944 (note) in the fragment quoted, τραγωδίαν should surely be marked as a conjecture if it is intended to replace the MS. reading μελωδίαν ; l. 1004 (note) read οἰκοδομήσας ; l. 1349 (note) *glomus* as a masc. noun has hardly survived Bentley's note on *Hor. Epp.* i. 13, 14. There are minor misprints in the notes to 295, 216 and on p. 110 [*Aristot.*] *Rep. Ath.* is printed, while p. 111 gives *Aristot. Rep. Ath.*

F. W. HALL.

Westminster.

KIRKLAND'S EDITION OF HORACE.

Horace, Satires and Epistles. Edited on the basis of Kiessling's edition, by JAMES H. KIRKLAND, Ph. D. Boston: Leach, Shewell and Sanborn, 1893. Pp. xxiii, 399. \$1.20.

THIS edition of the *Satires and Epistles* all students of Horace will gladly welcome. It is one of the volumes of 'The Students' Series of Latin Classics,' published under the general supervision of Prof. Pease of the Leland Stanford Junior University, and Prof. Peck of Columbia University. The aim of this series is to furnish editions 'of the Latin authors that are usually read in American schools and colleges.' The series thus appeals primarily to college students. Prof. Kirkland's purpose, as set forth in his preface, is 'to supply the student more liberally than has heretofore been done in American editions with such information as is needed for the full understanding and enjoyment' of Horace. To the attainment of this end some of the *Satires and Epistles* have been left without annotation in order that space might be gained for a fuller treatment of the others. The full text, however, is given in every case. The Introduction treats, among other things, of the history of Roman satire prior to Horace, of the characteristics of Horatian satire, of the language of the *Satires and Epistles*, and of the metre. When the book comes to a second edition, that portion of the Introduction which deals with pre-Horatian satire will need revision in the light of Prof. Hendrickson's article on 'The Dramatic Satire and the Old Comedy at Rome,' in the *Amer. Journ. of Philol.*, XV, pp. 1-30. The sections on the language are particularly good. Attention has been called by others e.g. by Palmer in his edition and by F. Barta in two special pamphlets, to the fact that, in the *Satires* especially, Horace repeatedly uses words and phrases borrowed from the *sermo plebeius*, or at least, from the looser and less conventional language of every-day conversation. In no previous edition, however, so far as I am aware, was this subject worked out in detail. Prof. Kirkland has thus done a real service in making the results of special investigations in this interesting and important field accessible to the ordinary student.

The commentary is in general happy, and well fulfils the purpose which the author had in view. Not only have the editors of

Horace been studied, but articles on special points in the various learned journals have been consulted. The notes are not cumbersome, and extraneous matters are usually excluded. If there is any error here at all, it is at times on the side of brevity. Though his work is confessedly based on Kiessling's edition, Prof. Kirkland everywhere shows independence of judgment, differing from Kiessling not infrequently, and often, to my mind, rightly. A notable instance may be found in the introductory note to *Sat. i. 5*, in which Kirkland advocates the date 38 B.C. as against the spring of 37, vigorously upheld by Kiessling. Some of the points in which I should be most inclined to take issue with Prof. Kirkland are the very ones in which he follows Kiessling most closely. A case in point is *Sat. i. l. 36, simul inversum contristat Aquarius annum* (see this *Review*, February, 1896, p. 31). There are many good notes, also, not suggested at all by Kiessling's commentary.

The editor has frequently referred to general works like Becker's *Gallus*,¹ or Marquardt's *Privatleben*. It would seem that in editions intended primarily for the use of college students there should be a page set apart for a brief description of all the works cited (giving date and place of publication, price, etc.), as well as of the abbreviations employed in citing them. The list in part I., pp. xvii-xx, of Lanman's *Sanskrit Reader* indicates just what I mean. For English speaking students references to Lanciani's *Ancient Rome* would have been useful in a number of places.

Some special points may now be noted. On p. xii correct the reference to *Ep. 2. 222* to read *Ep. 2. 2. 22*; in the text at *Sat. i. l. 44* add a question mark at the end of the line. In the note on *Sat. i. l. 108 ut avarus* is treated as an explanatory phrase with causal force, and *ut mule sanos, Epp. i. 19. 3*, is cited as a parallel. In the note on the latter passage, however, *ut* is rightly taken as *ex quo, ever since*. On *Sat. ii. l. 34* we read, 'according to Jerome's chronology (see on *S. l. 4. 6*), Lucilius was only 46 years old when he died . . .'. Yet in the note on *Sat. l. 4. 6*, though the dates of the birth and death of Lucilius are given, nothing whatever is said of Jerome's chronology. On *Sat. i. 9. 36 vadato* is described as an

¹ Cited, without comment, from the latest German revision.

impersonal ablative absolute, and *parto*, *Sat.* i. 1. 94, and *excepto*, *Epp.* i. 10. 50, are cited as parallels. In truth, these participles are in a wholly different construction, as Prof. Kirkland saw when he wrote his note on *Epp.* i. 10. 50. On *Epp.* ii. 1. 60 the statement is made that Pompey's theatre 'had room for forty thousand spectators.'¹ Friedlaender, in Marquardt's *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii.² 531, states that Pompey's theatre had space for 17,580 persons, that of Balbus for 11,510 and that of Marcellus for about 20,000. On *Sat.* i. 4. 71 it is stated that 'Book-shops were often situated in some *porticus*, on the columns of which . . . lists of the books for sale were written.' Is this true? At any rate, neither the *Ars Poetica*, 372, nor *Mart.* i. 117, to which alone Prof. Kirkland refers, proves any such thing. Martial's words, *taberna scriptis postibus hinc et inde totis, omnes ut cito perlegas poetas*, point to a totally different view, that, for instance, advocated by Overbeck, *Pompeii*,⁴ p. 379. On *Sat.* i. 4. 129 *ex hoc ego sanus ab illis perniciem quaecumque ferunt, sanus ab* is compared with *aeger ab animo, valere ab oculis*, which seem hardly parallel, since in *sanus ab* the separative force is clearly recognizable, whereas in the other phrases it has virtually disappeared. On *Sat.* i. 10. 21 Prof. Elmer's paper² in the *Proceedings of*

the American Philological Association 1892, pp. xviii.-xxiii., might have been consulted and referred to. A note bringing together all the passages in both *Satires* and *Epistles* that show reminiscences of Lucretius, as well as an explanation of the causes which led Horace to the careful study of that author would have been both interesting and valuable (cf. e.g. the paper entitled *De Horatio Lucretii Imitatore*, by Ad. Wein-gaertner, in the *Dissertationes Philologicae Halenses* ii, 1-50.)

Finally, some misprints and errors in citations may be noted. In note on *Sat.* i. 1. 58 correct reference to *Od.* 4. 9. 2; on *Sat.* i. 4. 139 read *includunt* for *includunt*; *Sat.* i. 5. 3 correct Strabo 5,23 to 5,233; on i. 5. 16 read *viator* for *viatore*. On *Sat.* i. 5. 38 the reference should be to *Sat.* i. 10. 81, on i. 5. 59 to v. 62, not v. 2, on *Sat.* i. 6. 23, to *Epp.* i. 6. 37, on *Sat.* i. 6. 27 to *Sat.* i. 5. 36, on *Epp.* i. 1. 37 to *Ov. Fast.* iv. 315 (not 41. 313), on *Epp.* i. 1. 45 to *Sat.* i. 1. 30, on *Epp.* i. 2. 60 to *Aen.* i. 8, on *Epp.* i. 7. 94 to *Aen.* ii. 141, on *Epp.* ii. 2. 95 to *Epp.* i. 7. 32, on *Epp.* ii. 2. 126 to *Sat.* ii. 5. 71. In the note on *Sat.* i. 9. 6 Ter. *Eun.* ii. 3. 50. 51 is cited in a badly garbled form, owing to lack of proper punctuation; the note on *Epp.* i. 2. 32 is due to a careless copying of Kiessling. Lastly, on p. 322 read *laedat* for *laedit*, and *artibus* for *altibus*.

CHARLES KNAPP.

Barnard College.

¹ The same statement is made by Prof. Elmer, in his recent edition of the *Phormio*, p. xxix, and by Middleton, *Remains of Ancient Rome*, II, 65.

² Cf. this *Review*, vi. p. 324 b.

MOULTON AND GEDEN'S CONCORDANCE TO THE GREEK TESTAMENT.

A Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers, edited by the Rev. W. F. MOULTON and Rev. A. S. GEDEN. Pp. xii., 1037. Price 26s. net. Clark. 1897.

THE need of a concordance adapted to the best critical texts of the G. T. has long been felt, and the gratitude of all scholars is due to the editors who have undertaken the arduous task of revising Bruder's well-known book on this principle. It is much to be regretted, however, that the senior editor, to whom students of the G. T. are so much indebted for his excellent edition of *Winer's Grammar*, should have been prevented by illness from taking his full share

in the work of revision. I propose here to mention the main differences, independent of the Text, which are to be found between the old Bruder and the new Concordance, noticing by the way any points in which it seems to me that there is still room for further improvement. I will call the former B and the latter M.

M adds diacritical marks, to denote (a) that a word is not to be found in the Greek versions of the O.T. including the Apocrypha, (b) that it is found in one or other of these versions, but not in the LXX. version of the canonical Hebrew Scriptures, (c) that it is not in classical use. The addition of these marks is a decided advantage, but I think the line of demarcation between classical and non-classical is somewhat arbi-

trarily fixed at the Christian era. If there is a non-classical writer it is Polybius. Surely the main factor in the change was the Macedonian conquest, with the consequent submerging of the Attic in the common Greek. I a little doubt also the importance of distinguishing between classes (a) and (b). It is of course impossible to avoid slight inaccuracies in bestowing such marks. Some are corrected in p. 1035; one which is still uncorrected is ἀποσκίασμα, which is not distinguished as non-classical, though it is first used by St. James and does not occur again before the fourth century A.D.

The quotations are given more fully in M than in B: sometimes indeed with almost unnecessary fulness; but in such a passage as Matt. 22, 37 it is a great improvement to have the full phrase ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου, instead of the abbreviated ἀγαπήσεις Κύριον of B, which makes it difficult to understand the following note 'ἐν LXX. ἐξ Deut. 6, 5.' Compare also B's unintelligible quotation on ἀγαπάω (Joh. 19, 26) μαθητὴν παρ. ὃν ἡγάπα, and on ἀδικία (Rom. 6, 13) ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἡμ., with M's ἰδὼν...τ. μαθητὴν παρ. ὅσα ὅπλα ἀδικίας, and μὴδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας.

M gives the Hebrew of all quotations from the O.T., B gives the LXX. where it differs from the N.T. It might be well to give both. B also gives the Hebrew of all proper names.

B gives various readings from important MSS., M gives only the variations of the three texts mentioned in the Title. It would, I think, have been well to notice the more remarkable variations in the chief MSS., e.g. such a word as παραβάτης in D's addition to Luke 6, 4, or the reading ἀγδία in L. 23, 12. Sometimes the notation seems to stand in need of explanation, e.g. under ἀδελφός, Mt. 12, 47, we read '—h.v. [T] WH non mg,' which is likely to cause perplexity to youthful readers.

As regards the saving of space by omission of words or examples, M goes much further than B, omitting καί and δέ entirely, while B gives all the passages in which δέ occurs, and all examples of καί (filling pp. 453—475) which are not simply copulative. The only other omissions in B are under ὁ, ἡ, τό, which still occupies pp. 580—604, and under the relative ὅς, ἣ, ὅ, occupying pp. 618—623; while M devotes less than nine pages to the former, and for the most part, both under the article and the relative, gives references only, without quoting. It is the

same with ἀλλά, ἀπό, γάρ, εἰς, ἐν, ἐκ, and many other indeclinable words, in which I confess that I find the list of references far less satisfactory than the actual quotations, though I agree that we are overdone with examples of simple δέ in B. But a mere statement of the different uses of καί distinguished by B, will show at what a cost of valuable matter M's economy of space has been purchased. B gives here (1) examples of ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, (2) such uses as πολλὰ καὶ ἕτερα, (3) a rather loose heading 'καὶ rhetoricae indolis,' under which we find quoted αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται, (4) οὐτε...καί, (5) 'καὶ ubi alii ἢ exhibent,' (6) καί...καί, (7) καὶ in oratione historica ex simplici Hebraeorum narrandi modo, (8) καὶ followed by a particle of time, (9) following a notice of time, (10) logical use, (11) καὶ ἐπεξεργητικόν, (12) καί=porro, (13) καί=etiā, (14) καὶ following ὡς or καθὼς. Again, under δέ, it is a pity to have lost the exx. of δέ in apodosis, and δέ tertio, quarto, quinto loco positum. Surely if it was desired to save space it would have been better to omit the endless repetitions of ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν, ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν or the 39 exx. of ἐγενήσεν in Matt. i., than entirely to ignore these important distinctions in the uses of καί and δέ.

I proceed to compare some of the headings in which the more remarkable uses of a word are classified. These may be divided into inflexional and syntactical. In regard to inflexions, it seems to be unnecessary to specify any which are not either unusual in form or distinctive in meaning, like the transitive and intransitive tenses of ἵστημι: and no form should be specified unless it actually occurs. In all these respects I think both B and M are unsatisfactory, the latter rather the worse of the two. Thus under βάλω M has ἔβαλα, but the only instance is ἔβαλαν in Acts 16, 37, and we have no right to assume that the principle of analogy which gave birth to the one must have been strong enough to evoke the other: under ἔχω it has εἶχα, but the only instances are εἶχαν and εἶχαμεν: under ἔρχομαι it has ἦλθα (and so εἰσῆλθα) though no instance of the 1st sing. is cited. On the other hand under ἀφίημι no notice is taken of the unusual forms ἀφεῶνται L. 5. 20, 7. 48, ἤφιεν Mk. 1. 24, ἀφείς Apoc. 2. 20, ἀφίομεν L. 11. 4, ἀφίονσιν Apoc. 11. 9, nor of ἀνέπεσαν under ἀνατίπτω, nor of ἐξεστάκεσαν under ἐξίστημι, nor of φάγομαι under ἐσθίω (though ἐσθω is given), nor of εἰσελήλθαν under εἰσέρχομαι, nor of οἶδασιν, nor of κάθον; yet the ordinary

forms ἐβουλήθη, γινῆς, διδῶσιν, ἐδίδουσαν, are specified under their respective verbs.

Turning now to syntactical uses and phrases I do not find any decided superiority in M over B. On the one hand, M is better under ἄνθρωπος, where it alone particularizes the phrase κατὰ ἄνθρ., under ἅγιος, where it specifies (1) πνεῦμα ἁγ., (2) τὸ ἅγιον, τὰ ἅγια, (3) ὁ ἁγ. τοῦ θεοῦ, (4) ἅγιοι, against B's solitary τὸ ἅγιον, τὰ ἅγια; under αἰών, where it specifies (1) ὁ νῦν αἰών, ὁ αἰ. οἶτος, (2) ὁ αἰών ὁ μέλλον, ὁ ἐρχόμενος, (3) εἰς τ. αἰῶνα, τ. αἰῶνας, (4) εἰς τ. αἰῶνας τ. αἰώνων, (5) ἀπ' αἰῶνος, of which the last three are omitted in B; and under βλέπω, where B omits the important use βλέπετε μῆ. On the other hand, B has the advantage under ἀπό, in specifying ἀπό μακρόθεν, ἀπό ἁνωθεν, and in giving the full phrase ἀπὸ ὃ ὦν καὶ ὃ ἦν, of which M only gives the first part ἀπὸ ὃ ὦν, the abbreviation being all the more mischievous, because only references follow, without quotations. Again under ἀποδίδωμι, where B distinguishes between the active and middle voices with their divergent meanings, M has simply '(1) absol., (2) ἀπ. ὅρκου, λόγον.' Of (1) he gives such examples as ἀπόδος εἴ τι ὀφείλεις, which I see no reason for separating from ὁ πατήρ ἀποδώσει σοι, or ἀποδώσει ἐκάστω κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν: under (2) he combines two phrases which cannot be said to throw much light on one another, 'to render an account' and 'to perform an oath.' Under ἀποκρίνομαι M omits the useful distinction which occurs in B 'initio orationis nulla interrogatione antecedente'; under ἀρχή it omits the adverbial use of the accusative; under ὁ αὐτός it omits the construction with the dative, of which we have an example in 1 Cor. 11, 5. Other cases in which the classification of uses seems to me defective are γίνομαι, where nothing is said of the construction with the infinitive, so common in St. Luke, or with another finite verb. Instead of these, we have the quite insignificant heads '(1) γ. ὥς, (2) seq. dat.' Under εἰ and εἰ μὴ it is a pity to have omitted B's head *c. subj.*, while keeping *c. opt.*, and inserting *c. subj.* under εἴ τις. Under εἰ μὴ it would have been well to have distinguished between its use with, or without a verb, the latter being far the commoner in the G.T. Under ἐξέρτω M has *seq. accus.* which gives a wrong im-

pression unless we add *cum infinitivo*. Under ἀρνέομαι, for the very illogical heads '(1) *c. accus.*, (2) ἀρν. τ. πίστιν,' read (1) ἀρν. τινα, (2) ἀρν. τι. Under ἐπικαλέω such dissimilar phrases as ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου σωθήσεται and ἐφ' οὗς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς are put in the same category. Under ἂν M has (1) ἕως ἂν, (2) ὃς ἂν, (3) ὅστις ἂν, (4) *c. indic.*, (5) *c. opt.*, (6) ὅσοι ἂν, (7) ὅπως ἂν, (8) ὡς ἂν, (9) ἂν τις, ἂν *condit.* This again is anything but a logical division. It would be far more natural to divide as follows, (a) ἂν in principal clause, (1) *c. ind.*, (2) *c. opt.*; (b) ἂν in subordinate clause, (1) *c. subj.*, (2) *c. ind.* [M puts into the same class ὅπου ἂν εἰσπορεύετο and πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν]; and to arrange M's 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, under b. 1: then (c) should include elliptical uses, such as some of those cited under ὡς ἂν, and (d) ἂν=ἐάν, would correspond to M's 9. Under αὐτός I cannot see what purpose is served by specifying αὐτός δέ and καὶ αὐτός, while no notice is taken of the unemphatic use of the nom. αὐτός. Under ἀνά, instead of M's (1) ἀνὰ μέσον, (2) ἀνὰ εἰς ἕκαστος, it would have been better to distinguish the local and distributive uses, and name M's (2) as an irregular case of the latter, comparing the similar use of κατὰ.

This may suffice to illustrate the kind of changes which I should desire in the classification of uses. I may mention also that there is nothing to distinguish between proper names and ordinary nouns in the thick black capitals of M, and that the asterisk, obelisk, &c. employed in B to mark the different uses of a word, catch the eye more readily than the figures used in M. I think further that it would be well to make more use of cross reference: e.g. ἄγε appears as a separate article: I should prefer not to separate it from ἄγωμεν: in any case I should refer to it under ἄγω. So there should be cross references between ἀγαθοεργέω 1 Ti. 6. 18 and ἀγαθοουργέω Acts 14. 17.

I have only noticed one misprint, σοι for σοι (Mt. 6. 18) under ἀποδίδωμι, but there has been quite a fatality in the matter of dropped letters, [A]σύνετος, [Ei]κῆ, Ἀνθρωπ[os].

J. B. MAYOR

VON ARNIM'S EDITION OF CHRYSOSTOM.

Dionis Prusaensis, quem vocant Chrysostomum, quae exstant, ed. J. DE ARNIM. Vol. II. Berolini. Weidmann. 1896. 14 M.

MR. VON ARNIM'S estimate of the MS. tradition of the Corpus of Dio's writings, as briefly and clearly stated in the preface to his first volume, may, it appears to me, be regarded as final. I sincerely hope that he may find it possible to devote his industry and insight to the solution of the seemingly more complicated, but allied problem, presented by the tradition of the Plutarchean Corpus.

The main facts determined by the editor are briefly as follows. The Leiden codex M (of which the imperfect Vatican V is a cousin, not a descendant) contains the Corpus of Dio's writings in the order of Photius' Catalogue, and the antiquity of its archetype is thus attested. Derived from a copy of the same archetype (an uncial codex) is the group of MSS. of which the Palatine P is the chief representative. This copy of the archetype was a more accurate and genuine one than that which is the source of MV, since many sound readings which cannot be due to Byzantine correction are found in P where MV offer a corrupt text. Unfortunately when this (P) copy of the archetype was made, the latter was in a mutilated condition, so that for a considerable part of the Corpus, P fails us. Mr. von Arnim's hypothesis that this mutilated state of the archetype is of older date than its perfect state (*i.e.* that parts of it were lost and subsequently recovered) is devised to account for the treatment of the treatise *περί φθόρου* (77-78) in M. Only part of it is contained in P, the missing latter part is contained in M but with a new title. It might be possible by the exercise of ingenuity to dispute Mr. von Arnim's conclusion that this and the other lacunae in P are only to be accounted for on the supposition

he makes, but it would be certainly futile to do so, as the question of the relative dates at which P and M radiated from the parent tree is quite immaterial.

None of these MSS. are free from interpolation; but the group of MSS. of which the Urbinas (U) is the chief representative, are far more deeply tainted with this vice and, as has happened in the case of other authors, it is from one of this worst group (which has many extant representatives) that the vulgate text of Dio is derived. They contain the treatises, of course, in the received order (which the editor has been wise in preserving), and they all go back to a MS. of the celebrated library of Arethas. The copyist's errors which this group share with M, show that they are derived from a copy of the archetype intermediate between it and M.

On the principle imposed by these facts the editor has constructed his text. Notwithstanding the contributions, in not a few cases very brilliant, made by himself and Professor von Wilamowitz to the emendation of the text, a great deal still remains to be done in this respect, and doubtless will be done, now that conjectural criticism is stimulated by the consciousness that it is not wasting its acumen in trying to reform a text of the facts of the tradition of which it is ignorant. I would recall the notice of the editor to my protest (in a notice of the first volume of this edition) against his too frequent tendency to bracket words and sentences. It may seem to an editor a light and innocuous remedy, but it is one calculated to dull the critical consciousness of a reader, and it is from the casual, but would-be conscientious reader, who approaches an author with his mind full of other things that the best emendations may be expected.

W. R. PATON.

LUPUS'S TRANSLATION OF FREEMAN'S SICILY.

Geschichte Siciliens von EDWARD A. FREEMAN. Deutsche Ausgabe von BERNHARD LUPUS (Leipzig: Teubner. 1895, 1897). Vols. 1, 2. 20 M. each.

THE last work of the late Mr. Freeman has received the compliment of translation into

German: it has received the further compliment, not always paid to translated works, of being translated extremely well. Dr. Bernhard Lupus has long been known as an eminent authority on the history of Syracuse in Greek times. In 1885 he issued a monograph on ancient Syracuse: in 1887

he brought out a handy German edition of Cavallari and Orsi's great *Topografia di Siracusa*, and his edition was abridged and adapted with so much skill and scholarship that, except in the matter of maps, it is practically a better book than the splendid but somewhat cumbrous original. Now he has undertaken to translate into German Mr. Freeman's *History of Sicily* and the first two volumes are before me. They correspond to the first two volumes of the English original, that is to say, they carry the reader down to 433 B.C. and end just before the commencement of Athenian interference with the island. The translation, so far as I can judge, is accurate and admirable. The text of the original has been translated tolerably literally, but in the notes and appendices Dr. Lupus has allowed himself a little reasonable liberty and has made occasional corrections and additions, which seem to be distinct improvements in detail, without being numerous or obtrusive enough to alter the character of Freeman's work. The maps have been more freely treated. Their contents, of course, are the same as those of the English maps, but they have been drawn afresh and in one case, the position of Hybla near Megara, a change has been introduced. One of Dr. Lupus' maps is a distinct improvement on the original: it is a map of Selinus in the first volume; in other respects, I should be inclined to say that both the English and the German maps are good and that we might be quite happy with either.

One passage in the second volume concerns me personally. I was rash enough in an earlier number of this review (1889 March) to suggest that the name Achradina belonged properly only to the lower ground round the harbours and not to the hill which makes an eastern end to Epipolae. This Achradina I was inclined to identify with the Outer City of Thucydides. Neither Dr. Lupus writing in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbuch*, nor Mr. Freeman, nor Dr. Lupus translating Mr. Freeman will hear of the suggestion. Nevertheless, I still think that there may be 'something' in it. Achradina, as it is usually mentioned by ancient writers, is on low ground; it is

also usually the name of a city-quarter, that is, it denotes inhabited ground, not ground simply. Now the inhabited ground which suits Achradina is undoubtedly the lower ground near the Island and the harbours. The hill-top, or three-quarters of it, shows no traces of having ever been dwelt upon or covered by houses, while the stately buildings which Cicero ascribes to Achradina were undoubtedly, as Mr. Freeman and every one admits, down on the lower ground. Mr. Freeman gets round this difficulty by talking of an Upper Achradina and a Lower Achradina. There is no warrant for such terms either in literature or in topography. It is to be observed that the slope from this lower ground up to the hill-top is gradual, except where quarries have made an artificial cliff. As a friend wrote once to me from Syracuse, there is no spot where you can say 'the brow of "Achradina" begins here,' as you walk up from Ortygia. The distinction between an Upper and a Lower Achradina is, therefore, not a natural one. On the other hand, just for this very reason, I should not wish (as Dr. Lupus supposed me to wish) to limit my Achradina strictly between the quarries and the docks. It extended, I imagine, as far northwards as habitation extended, that is (so far as my evidence serves), not quite up to the word *Grab* in Dr. Lupus' map. The question is, however, a very difficult one, and I must leave it for others to discuss. I have only turned aside to touch upon it here, in order to satisfy my own doubts as to the rightness of the current opinion. This opinion appears to me to agree very inadequately with the facts I have mentioned in these columns and equally inadequately with the facts mentioned by Mr. Freeman. It does not agree at all with the reason given by Thucydides for the construction of the new wall in 415-414 (vi. 75 ὅπως μὴ δὲ ἐλπίσσοιτο, etc.). It is needless to add that my heresy on the subject does not in the least diminish my admiration for Mr. Freeman's book and for the able manner in which Dr. Lupus has made it accessible to German readers.

F. HAVERFIELD.

GEVAERT ON THE SECOND DELPHIC HYMN.

La Mélodie Antique dans le chant de l'église latine. Par FR. AUG. GEVAERT; second appendice. Gand: Ad. Hoste; Oxford: James Parker and Sons. 2s.

M. GEVAERT has fulfilled the promise made in the work reviewed in these columns (*Class. Rev.* 1896, p. 70), and now presents us with a transcription and discussion of the second hymn discovered at Delphi. His transcription differs only in minute particulars from that of M. Reinach, but in his interpretation of the document he pronounces a more decided opinion than the French scholar on the questions raised by the changes of key etc. in the hymn. He justly condemns M. Reinach's hesitation in deciding between the Dorian and Minolydian modes, the former of which is throughout that of the hymn. The question of mode cannot have been indifferent to the composer, even to the limited extent supposed by M. Reinach. Incidentally M. Gevaert expresses his disagreement (on general grounds) with the views of Mr. Monro (p. 465, note 3). In conclusion he gives an interesting summary of the chief facts which may be learnt from recent discovery as to the methods of ancient composers. We should be disposed, however, to question whether it is so clear as M. Gevaert supposes that the melody of a

strophic composition, such as a Pindaric ode, was necessarily prior to the words. Such strophes are after all combinations of well-defined rhythmical phrases, only with less regularity than e.g. the typical stanzas of Aeolic poetry, to which, no doubt, an infinite variety of melodies might be and were applied. The development of a 'rhythmical idea' into a Pindaric strophe may in some cases at least (the Epode of Pyth. ii. is a good instance) be followed with tolerable certainty, although we associate no melody with the text.

In a second section M. Gevaert discusses and rejects the explanations of the symbol N (or H), appearing in the MSS. of Mesomedes' hymn to the Muse, which have recently been put forward by MM. Van Jan and Reinach, in both cases with justice. He is himself disposed to see in the symbol a corruption of the *instrumental* note \mathfrak{M} , which he would regard as an indication to the accompanist. There is no objection on melodic grounds to the use of A natural in the passages affected, but the fact that one and the same instrumental note appears in precisely four places, in the absence of any parallel case in the MS. text of the hymns, seems suspicious.

H. STUART JONES.

THE CLASSICS FOR ITALIAN SCHOOLS.

I tre Poemi, Iliade, Odissea, Eneide, nelle migliori Traduzioni Italiane compendiate in alcune parti; con Note, Studi vari, e Riproduzioni Artistiche, per Uso delle Scuole Medie.

THIS Italian work will well reward the reader from beginning to end. It is a *compendio* of the original poems only, but the parts are so carefully selected, so aptly, fully and simply joined in the author's own prose, and the guiding idea is so tenaciously, almost enthusiastically carried out to the end, that the wish, that Italy in her need may possess many more such faithful schoolmasters, must be felt by all lovers of the youthful readers whom Prof. Paolo

Graziano Clerici is trying to benefit. For, the aim of the commentator in presenting the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Aeneid*, in this form is, to bring his scholars into more than the superficial touch hitherto possible to them with Homer and Virgil. In Italy, the study of the sciences has narrowed the time allowed for that of the Classics, even where they are still obligatory, so sharply down, 'that the boys can, at most, read but one Book of Virgil and a few hundred lines of Homer.' With these words the author expressed the disappointing results of his best efforts during many years.

This loss, morally and socially considered, at last persuaded the country to direct that a knowledge of the three great Epic Poems

should also be imparted in a summary form from the best Italian Translations, and two years later, in 1891, this compendium appeared accompanied by the approval and praise of literary men, among whom was Ruggiero Bonghi. The second edition was issued this year; it is far superior to the first, containing at the end of each Book useful and appropriate notes of explanation, besides illustrations after photographs of valuable pictures and sculptures belonging to modern, mediæval and classic times, one from a sarcophagus at Volterra, two from the paintings of Pompei, and others from famous galleries, chiefly of Italy, all welcome to the eye as old friends whom one is glad to meet. Yet the ornamental part of the work is but a happy addition to it; that which strikes the reader most is the thoroughness of the treatment throughout. The parts chosen, the succinct but perfect connection between them in prose, and the Notes, be they etymological interpretations

of words like *guiderdons*, moral comments on the allegorical meaning of *Moli*, or astronomical explanations, everything testifies to the vigilance of the author. As regards the choice of the Italian Translations to be used, Prof. Clerici says himself that he could not make a mistake, as he received Instructions, namely Monti's for the *Iliad*, Caro's for the *Aeneid* and either Pindemonte's or Maspero's version for the *Odyssey*. He chose Pindemonte for the first, and Maspero for the last, twelve Books.

Finally the work contains in their right places excursions on ancient art, on the more difficult mythological questions, on comparative literature, and especially on the connexion of Dante's Divine Comedy with the VIth. Book of *Aeneid*. They are more difficult than the Notes, intended to lead the young readers further, and will afford an intellectual treat to all interested in this subject.

M. H.

FRAGMENTUM CYCLICI INCERTI.

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ. ποῖόν σ' ὄχημα πρὸς τὰδ' ἦγαγε
στέρη;
ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ. πιστόν γε θεῶν δώρημα, Κεν-
ταύρων γένος.¹
Β. ἀλλ' οὐ καθ' ἵππον εἰκάσαι τις
ἂν τάχος.
Α. οὐχ ἱππόμορφον ἀλλ' ὑφ' Ἡφαί-
στου τέχνης—
Β. κλύων ἰθαύμας, εἰ τὰδ' Ἡφαί-
στω μέλει.

¹ τὸ τῆς μηχανῆς ὄνομα σημαίνει δηλονότι· πολλῶν τε γὰρ οὐσῶν καὶ καλῶν καὶ πολλαχῶς λεγομένων ἐν ταῖς πρώταις ἐτιμῶντο αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν Κενταύρων ὀνομαζόμεναι.

ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ. σιδηροτεύκτοις μηχαναῖς κλύει
δεταί.
ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ. οὐκὼν ἐρετμοῦς δαιδάλους πε-
ρὼν λέγεις.
Α. δισσοῦς γὰρ ἦλας' αὐτόπους
μόνος τροχούς.
Β. θεός δ' εἴσει καὶ ταῦτα μαν-
θάνειν;
Α. πόλει μὲν οὖν ἐχρησε πανδημεὶ
κυκλεῖν.

F. POLLOCK.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

ANCIENT COINS FROM PONDOLAND.

AMONG a number of bronze Greek and Roman coins belonging to Mr. Thomas Cook, of Messrs. Cook Brothers, Concessionaires of East Pondoland, are some which were found at Fort Grosvenor about four years ago. The site of what had once been a Kaffir hut was

being excavated in search of treasure, when, some ten feet below the surface, the diggers came upon a calabash which crumbled away in their hands. It contained three Ptolemaic coins, and some (the owner is unfortunately no longer certain which) of the Roman coins described below. The Ptolemaic coins, which I have classed, so far as their condition per-

mits, according to the attributions given in the British Museum Catalogue of the Coins of the Ptolemies, are as follows:—

Ptolemy I. or II.

1. *Obv.* Head of Zeus to right, laureate.
Rev. [ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ] ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ.
Eagle on thunderbolt to left, wings spread.
In field, uncertain monograms.
Size 1·1 inches.
Compare B. M. Catalogue, p. 17, No. 29.

Ptolemy II.

2. *Obv.* Head of Zeus to right, laureate.
Rev. ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ.
Eagle on thunderbolt to left, wings closed.
Between its legs, uncertain monogram.
Size 1·15 inches.
Compare B. M. Catalogue, p. 32, No. 107.

Ptolemy IV.

3. *Obv.* Head of Zeus Ammon to right, diademed. Border of dots.
Rev. ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ.
Eagle on thunderbolt to left, wings closed, head reverted; cornucopiae with fillets on left wing; between eagle's legs, A or Λ.
Size 1·55 inches.
Compare B. M. Catalogue, p. 66, No. 36.

The Roman coins some of which were found with the Ptolemaic are of very much later date, being all of the period immediately following the reform of Diocletian in A.D. 296. They are as follows:—

Diocletian.

1. *Obv.* IMP C DIOCLETIANVS P F AVG. Head to right, laureate.
Rev. GENIO POPVLI ROMANI.
Genius with patera and cornucopiae. In field to right $\frac{A}{I}$, to left XX. In exergue, mintmark ALE.
Cohen, *Monn. fr. sous l'Emp. Rom.*, No. 101.

Maximianus I. Herculeus.

- Obv.* IMP C M A MAXIMIANUS P F AVG. Head to right, laureate.

Rev. GENIO POPVLI ROMANI. Type of No. 1.

Cohen, No. 184.

Three varieties:—

2. (a) In field to right, A. In exergue, ALE.
3. (b) In field to right A; to left, star. In exergue, ALE.
4. (c) In field to right, $\frac{S}{V}$; to left K. In exergue, ANT.

Constantius I. Chlorus.

5. *Obv.* FL VAL CONSTANTIVS NOB CAES. Head to right, laureate.

Rev. GENIO AVGG ET CAESARVM NN. Type of No. 1. In exergue KB.
Cohen, No. 58.

Galeria Valeria (wife of Maximianus II).

6. *Obv.* GAL VALERIA AVG. Bust to right, diademed.
Rev. VENERI VICTRICI. Venus standing to left, holding apple in right, and raising veil with left. In field to right $\frac{P}{I}$; to left, K. In exergue ALE.
Cohen, No. 2.

Maximinus II. Daza.

7. *Obv.* GAL VAL MAXIMINVS NOB CAES. Head to right, laureate.
Rev. GENIO POPVLI ROMANI.
Type of No. 1. In field to right H. In exergue ANT.

Cohen, No. 81.

8. Another, *rev.* GENIO CAESARIS.
Type of No. 1. In field to left, $\frac{X}{\Delta}$, to r. K.

In exergue ALE.

Cohen, No. 40.

9. *Obv.* IMP C GAL VAL MAXIMINVS P F AVG. Head to right, laureate.

Rev. GENIO IMPERATORIS. Type of No. 1. In field to right $\frac{I}{P}$; to left crescent above K; in exergue ALE.

Cohen, No. 52.

Of these coins, which must have all been issued between the dates 296 and 313 A.D., Nos. 1–3, 6, 8, and 9 were struck at Alexandria; Nos. 4 and 7 at Antioch in Syria; and No. 5 at Cyzicus. The three Ptolemaic coins range between the years 305 and 204

B.C. This gap of over six centuries between the dates of issue of the two groups of coins may seem at first sight to detract from the value of the evidence. But in barbarous districts coins circulate for an almost incredible length of time, and we know that, for instance, Roman coins are at the present day offered in change in parts of the Spanish peninsula. The owner, who was present at the excavation, can testify to the fact that all the Ptolemaic and some of the Roman coins were found together in the circumstances described. It may therefore be supposed that the Ptolemaic coins arrived first in Pondoland, and were afterwards buried in combination with the Roman coins, which from their condition had, with the exception of No. 1, not been in circulation very long. There is nothing astonishing in the fact that in early times coins passed from hand to hand along what is now an important trade route. The daily papers last year had notices (the veracity of which has since been confirmed by personal evidence) of the discovery of a copper coin of Constantine in the same part of the world. Of course the presence of these coins in Pondoland does not imply the presence of Greek or Roman colonists, since coins travel much farther than individuals.

While the nature of our evidence makes it necessary to use all caution in drawing conclusions, it has at least seemed worth while to put the facts, such as they are, on record.

G. F. HILL.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GERMANY.

Wiesbaden.—The excavations on the site of the recently discovered Roman camp at Holzhausen in this neighbourhood have laid bare the four gates with their towers. Over the north-west gate (the *porta sinistra*) an inscription has been deciphered, in honour of Caracalla, dated A.D. 213. There are traces of another long inscription on the *porta praetoria*, the most imposing of the four gates, but it is too broken and fragmentary to be deciphered. Numerous silver coins of Caracalla, Septimius Severus, and Severus Alexander have come to light, all in excellent preservation; also a silver armlet, a primitive leaden armlet, fragments of glass vessels, and of *terra sigillata*. In the neighbourhood of the Praetorium was found a broken head of a Genius with a mural crown.¹

ITALY.

Paestum (Piedmont).—A pre-Roman tomb has been discovered, in which were two bronze fibulae of the form known as a *sanguisuga*. One is much larger and more perfect than the other; the foot

ends in a series of knobs, and it is ornamented with spots of white enamel. From the pin hang a ring with eight knobs (probably an ornament for the hair), a curious rectangular frame with two little cups, perhaps for cosmetics, and ten other objects, including an ear-pick, two nail-files, and three pairs of tweezers. They are probably imitations of the real objects made for sepulchral purposes.²

Florence.—Important Roman remains have come to light near the Baptistery, belonging to a large private house of the time of the Republic, and shewing in the arrangement of the rooms some remarkable peculiarities of the Tuscan style. The *atrium* or *cavaedium*, the *tablinum*, and some of the *cubicula* still exist, and are quite distinct, but the vestibule and door have been destroyed to make way for later constructions. In the *atrium* a headless marble dog was found, which recalls the *cave canem* mosaics at Pompeii. The coins and inscriptions are all of the later Imperial times, shewing that the house was inhabited down to those times. One inscription is a public decree by the *decuriones* of Florentia, another, a dedication in honour of Sextus Gabinus and another *vir illustris*.³

Imola.—Remains of a Roman bridge have been found in the river Santerno. On a block which has formed the keystone is an inscription, much injured. A mosaic pavement has also been found here, with various patterns for the different parts of the house. The best specimen is in the *tablinum*, the patterns consisting of bands of foliage with Bacchic masks and a tree-trunk with garlands of leaves and fruit, pomegranates and pines, all in polychrome.⁴

Baiae.—A *cippus* has been found with important inscriptions, relating to one L. Caecilius Dioscurus, *curator augustalium Cumanorum duplicarius et perpetuus embaenitariorum trierum pisciniensium*. The last three words must relate to makers of fishing-boats which were used on the *piscinae* attached to large villas, such as were possessed by Nero (at Baiae) and Severus Alexander. The inscription dates from the reign of the latter Emperor. The word *embaeniticam* occurs in Cic. *ad Fam.* viii. 1, 21, for a boat.⁵

Pompeii.—The houses in Insula xv. to the north of the house of Vettius have been completely investigated. They contained among other things a marble statue of a Nymph and two interesting terra-cotta figures. One of these represents a drunken old woman seated with a bowl in her left hand and a jar at her feet. It has served as a vase. The motive appears to be derived from a statue by Myron at Smyrna, mentioned by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxxvi. 32). The other has also served as a vase, and represents an elephant with a tower on its back, driven by a negro. The tower is fastened on by three chains, and over the body is drapery falling to the feet; on three sides of the castle are hung shields, and above are small openings. Among the paintings on the walls are Artemis and a youth, accompanied by two Cupids, a subject otherwise unknown; Perseus and Andromeda seated on a rock, the former holding up the Gorgon's head, the reflection of which is seen below; Helen and Paris at Sparta; Bacchus; and Venus Anadyomene.²

Atena (Lucania). A *cippus* has been discovered bearing an important inscription: C'EMPRONIVS' TI' F' AP' CLAVDIVS' C' F' P' LICINIVS' P' F' | III VIR' A' I' A. The three last letters stand for *agris iudicandis assignandis*, a title given by the Lex

² *Notizie dei Lincei*, Jan. 1897.

³ *Athenaeum*, 14 Aug.

⁴ *Notizie dei Lincei*, Feb. 1897.

¹ *Athenaeum*, 4 Sept.

Sempronia in B.C. 135. The inscription is a reminiscence of the work done by the Gracchi for the proletariat in distributing the *ager publicus* among the poor. P. Licinius was substituted for Tiberius Gracchus as triumvir when the latter was murdered. On the side of the *cippus* is inscribed K (= *Kardo*) VII, a surveyor's sign. Five similar boundary *cippi* have been found, one at Capua, now in the Naples Museum (C.I.L. i. 552 and x. 3861).⁵

SICILY.

Catania. A small necropolis of the latest Roman times has been excavated, with several rows of tombs arranged like those in the Christian catacombs. The objects found resemble those from the necropolis of Grotticelli at Syracuse. Two inscriptions were found, one in Greek, of a Christian character, the other in Latin relating to a soldier from Gallia Narbonensis belonging to the Legio Septima Gemina. This legion was created by Galba, and was recruited chiefly from Spain and that part of Gaul, but this is the first mention of it in Sicilian inscriptions.⁶

Modica. Dr. Orsi has made a discovery of some prehistoric stone-pits used as burial-places. They contained some very primitive stone knives, and earthen vessels characteristic of the first Sicilian period; also a vase of Dipylon style and fragments of a hydria with geometrical decoration.³

GREECE.

Paros. A new fragment of the Parian marble calendar has been found at Parikia, and finally decides the question of the real provenance of the other part. It contains thirty-three lines, describing events from 336 to 299 B.C., including the victories of Alexander and events under the earlier Diadochi. Unfortunately part of the stone relating to the more uncertain events is obliterated, but many new facts

about Ptolemy, Nikokreon of Cyprus, and Agathokles of Syracuse have been recovered, also a list of the victories of the comic poets Philemon and Menander, the death of a hitherto unknown poet Sosiphanes, and the eruption of Etna in 480 B.C. and other natural phenomena.⁷

ASIA MINOR.

Ephesus. During 1896 Prof. Benndorf excavated the Hellenistic city between the theatre and the Roman harbour. Many important remains of buildings came to light, including a gymnasium and an adjoining colonnade, and a magnificent building with columns of unusual size, having an elaborate wooden roof and a floor paved with geometrical patterns in thirteen different kinds of marble. Among the remains of sculpture were two statues over life-size, one in bronze of a nude youth, perhaps an original Attic work of the fifth century, the profile of the head recalling the Hermes of Praxiteles; the other is of white marble, representing a boy sitting with a duck under his left hand and supplicating for help with the right (for the type see Clarac, *Musée de Sculpt.* pls. 877, 877A). Also a group in black basalt of a Sphinx with the body of a lioness, tearing with her claws a youth lying prone on a rock; a fine male portrait head; a head of a woman, idealised, of late archaic style; and numerous bronzes, now mostly in Vienna, including a double bust of Herakles and Omphale and part of an incense-burner six feet high, very richly ornamented. Three hundred inscriptions have been found, one relating to the building of the city wall, in which one of the towers is styled *πύργος τοῦ Ἀστυάρχου πάγου*, and one of the hill-tops to the west, the Hermaion; this inscription also shews that at that time the sea came up to the foot of the hill.⁸

H. B. WALTERS.

⁵ *Notizie dei Lincei*, March 1897.

⁶ *Athenaeum*, 10 July.

⁷ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 24 July.

⁸ *Berl. Phil. Woch.*, 3 July.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Mnemosyne. N.S. Vol. xxiv. Part 4. 1896.

Képpara, S. A. Naber. Notes on Xenophon's Hellenica. *Soph. Oed. Tyrann.* 15, S. A. N. Reads *προσκέιμεθα* for *προσήμεθα*, and in Aesch. Pers. 880 *προσκέιμεναι* for *προσήμεναι*. *De Plutarchi Moraliū codicibus praecipue de codice Parisino D. n.* 1956, G. N. Bernardakis. 'Unus codex D saluus et incolumis, quantum quidem fieri poterat, ex gurgite illo vasto, quo fratres et parentes demersi sunt, evasit.' *Ad Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum.* H. van Herwerden. Critical notes. *De carminum Homerorum recensione Pisistratae*, M. Valetton. A criticism of the views of L. Erhardt and P. Cauer who have lately endeavoured to restore the belief in the genuineness of this recension. *De Cassii Dionis Zonaraeque historici Epistula critica ad Ursulum Philippum Boissacium*, K. Kuiper. Critical notes. *Ad Minucii Felicis Octaviū conjectanea*, J. C. G. Boot. *Virgilii Moretum*, H. T. Karsten. In l. 99 reads *testam* for *restem* and considers l. 60 spurious as well as 36 and 75. *Ad Cornelii Nepotis Cimōnem*, J. C. G. Boot. In iv. 2 reads *saepe*, *quum* *aliquem* *offensum* *forte* *in* *via* *eideret* *minus* *bene* *vestitum* *senem*, *amiculum* *dedit*.

Vol. xxv. Part 1. 1897.

Homeric (continued from vol. 20), J. van Leeuwen. On the raft of Ulysses. *Homeric*, H. van Herwerden. On N 541 and E 418 (*ἐπὶ δ' ἄσπις ἐάθη*), O 31, 535, 653, P 441, 742, S 393 sqq., Φ 322, Ψ 540, 602, Ω 358, 449-456, 720, 664, 729. *Observationes de iure Romano* (continued), J. C. Naber. (1) De bonorum possessione Carboniana, (2) Quomodo fiat conventio. *Pindarica*, H. van Herwerden. Various notes with special reference to Christ's new edition. *Ἑπας*, S. A. N. Some passages noticed in which this word is concealed by corruption. *Κορυμαῖα*, S. A. Naber. Notes on Xenophon's Memorabilia. *De Homeri Odysseae codice Phillipo* 1585, olim Meermanniano 307 (0), P. C. Molhuysen. *Ad Senecae dialogum de tranquillitate animi*, J. van der Vliet. Critical notes. *ὦς...καί*, *ad Thucyd.* vi. 36, J. v. L. In § 1 for *καί ὑποχείριος* reads *ὦς* *καί* *ὦς*. *Ad Herodoti librum I.*, H. van Herwerden. Various notes. *Ad Thucyd.* vi. 37, 1, J. v. L. Considers *κούφαις* spurious in this section. *Ad Caesarem*, A. Poutsma. On the following passages in De Bello Gallico, iv. 21, 1, 22, 3, 4, 23, 2, vi. 12, 6, vii. 54, 4. *Ad Thucyd.* vi. 37, 2, J. v. L. Suggests *εἰ* *πόλις*

ἑτέραν τοσαύτην ὅσαι Συρακούσαι εἰς ἕνα οἶκον οἰκῶσιν τὸν πόλεμον ποιοῦντο. *De templis Romanis* (continued from vol. 23), J. M. J. Valetón. Article on the Pomerium continued. Here he deals with the meaning of the word quoting the authorities, next with the definitions put forward by scholars, next with the buildings and extensions of the walls. [The greater part of this article is continued into the following number].

Part 2. *Homérica* (continued from the last no.), J. van Leeuwen. On the most ancient codd. of the *Odyssey*. *Observationes de jure Romano* (continued), J. C. Naber. (1) *Ad edictum divi Hadriani*, (2) *de centumviri judicio*. ὦς—εἰ. *Ad Thucyd.* ii. 38, 4, J. v. L. For ὡς δυνάτῃ would read εἰ δυνάτῃ. *Ad Aeschinam*, H. van Herwerden. Notes on the three extant orations. *Scholía Persii et Juvenalis*, J. van der Vliet. *Ad Aristophanem ejusque Scholias*, H. van Herwerden. Notes on the text and Scholia of The Peace.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 155. Part 2. 1897.

Das Schlachtfeld im Teutoburger walde, ii., A. Wilms. Continued from the last no. [*Cl. Rev.* sup. p. 175]. O. Keller's *Zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte*, F. Cramer. Part i., Latin etymologies, Part ii., Grammatical essays. *Zum rückmarsch des Xerxes*, F. Vogel. Supports the article of Welzhöfer [see sup. p. 84] which attempts to find the true proportions of Xerxes' march back, by a ref. to Xen. *Anab.* i. 2, 9. *Zu Ammianus Marcellinus*, K. Niemeyer. Various critical notes. *Zu Vitruvius de architectura*, O. Keller. In i. 11, defends *plerumque* where Frisemann has conjectured *plerarumque*. *Über die abhandlung de poematibus des Diomedes*, A. Buchholz. In opposition to the general opinion that this treatise is to be attributed to Suetonius, with the exception of a small portion, it is maintained that Diomedes used Probus directly for the whole treatise except the conclusion, for which he names another source, viz. Suetonius. *Zu J. A. Cramers anecdota Parisiensia*, O. Höfer. In vol. 4 p. 341 for *δορῶν κρηπίς λόγων* reads *φ. κοπίς λόγων* from Plut. Phok. 5.

Revue de Philologie. Vol. xxi. 2. April, 1897.

Sur l'expression de l'aoriste en latin, A. Meillet. *Sur un passage de l'Electre de Sophocle*, P. Masqueray. Maintains that the line after 1428 to correspond to 1409 is not wanting in the MSS., but is supplied by the cries of Clytaemnestra behind the scenes. *Hérodote* i. 126, E. Tournier. In the sentence αὐτός τε γὰρ δοκεῖ θείῃ τύχῃ γεγονώς τάδε ἐς χεῖρας ἄγεσθαι the predicate is in the participle and the meaning is 'nam et ego, qui hoc opus aggredior, divina sorte natus mihi videor.' *Dion Chrysostome*, Rhodiaca (xxx.), *observations critiques*. H. Weil. *Notes sur Thucydide*, E. Chambry. On various passages, critical and explanatory. *Clepsydra ou Hydraulé*, C. E. Ruelle. Simplicius in Aristotelis physica p. 160, v. has ἐν ταῖς ὑδραύλεισι where we expect ἐν ταῖς κλεψύδραις which Themistius has. The text of Simplicius is probably corrupt and should be corrected. *Vitruve*, xii., Preface 16, B. Haussoullier. The words *ipsius Dionae servus* refer to the *tepal παῖδες* of inscri. who were slaves belonging to the goddess. *Hornee*, Sat. i. 6, 14, A. Cartault. Reads *negante* for *notante*. *Frontin et Vitruve*, P. Tannery. The testimony of Frontinus, without

being decisive, weakens the authority of Vitruvius, and can be used in favour of rejecting parts. *Ovide*, G. Lafaye. In Met. ii. 278 suggests *fractaque* for *sacraque*. *Tacite*, L. Duvau. In Dial. Orat. 16 the unintelligible *sicut his clamet* represents *sicut in scaena*, a marginal note which has crept into the text.

Part 3. July, 1897.

Le 'Codex Thérnebi' de Plaute, W. M. Lindsay. A further account of this [see sup. p. 177]. *Plaute*, P. Berret. In Rud. 1139 proposes *situlecula* for *sicillecula* [see *Cl. Rev.* i. 306]. *Le roi des Saturnales*, L. Parmentier and F. Cumout. On the alleged sacrifice of the 'King' at the end of the Saturnalia in Moesia, as described in the Acts of St. Dasius. *Sur un passage du Catalogue des tragédies d'Eschyle*, M. Niedermann. For Σεμέλη ἡ ὑδροφόρος proposes Σ. ἡ ἡδροφόρος, see Schol. Apoll. Rhod. i. 636. *Notes critiques sur l'Anabase de Xénophon*, P. Cuvreur. *Un nouveau fragment tragique*, L. Havet. In Cicero Harusp. rep. 39, the words *deorum . . . figurantur* are probably from the *Athamas* of Attius. *Le gentilice de Tigellin*, P. Fabia. We must restore *Ofonium* in Tac. Ann. xiv. 51 etc. as against *Sophonium*, the conjecture of J. Lipsius. *Quae sit causa cur in indicanda Antiochidis patria inter duos pagos fluctet* *Pseudo-Plutarchus*, M. Niedermann. *Phaeder*, L. Havet. In i. 6. 2 proposes *nos loquere* for *malu videre*. *Séneque*, G. Lafaye. On the title *dialogi* applied to the philosophical treatises, also critical notes on *ad Helvium matrem de consolatione*. *Lettre à M. Éd. Tournier*, V. J. Keelhoff. In Herod. i. 86 [see sup. p. 174] defends the negative, but doubts the genitive after *πέσσαι* in prose. *Notes sur deux inscriptions de la confédération des Magnètes*, M. Holleaux. *Notes sur les fragments des Cynarides retrouvés dans un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque nationale*, C. E. Ruelle. *Orphica*, P. Tannery. On frag. i. Abel etc.

Hermathena. No. 23. 1897.

On Velleius Paterculus, Robison Ellis. Restores to Warburton some corrections published by him in 1736, also gives critical notes. *The Apocalypse of St. John*, in a Syriac version, hitherto unknown, T. K. Abbott. This has been edited from a MS. in the Earl of Crawford's Library by Prof. Gwynn, and is of much interest. *Novatian de Trinitate liber, its probable history*, J. Quarry. Maintains that it is quite unlike Novatian and is a translation from some Greek work, suggests that it is a version of the lost work of Hippolytus against Artemon. *Iccron and Our Lady of the Gate*, J. B. Bury. The Greek text of the events connected with the foundation of the convent of Ivérón, and the legend of the image that swam over the sea, from a MS. in Lincoln Coll. Library. *Aristophanes*, R. V. Tyrrell. In Pax 741-747 objects to the usual transposition of 742, 743 and suggests *φεύγοντας* for *φεύγοντας*. *Specimens of a translation of the Fourth Book of the Aeneid*, J. C. Martin. Notes on some passages in Cicero's *Letters*, J. S. Reid. In Fam. ix. 4 for *Coctio* read *Gargettio*, alluding to Epicurus: in Quint. fr. ii. 8 (10), for *non ab Hymetto sed ab taraysira* proposes *non a Gargetto sed ab Aldera*, alluding to Epicurus and Democritus: Att. iv. 17. 3 considers *toocinae* to be a depravation of *totus jacet*: Fam. xv. 18. 1 *†molestast* defends Baiter's *in oleo est* as alluding to the midnight lamp: Fam. v. 20. 2 *serco* should probably be *Laurea*, the name of the scribe.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

- Aeschylus*. Septem contra Thebas, ed. by F. G. Plaistowe, with Introduction and Notes. Crown 8vo. 80 pp. Clive. (Univ. Tut. Series.) 3s. 6d.
 — Septem contra Thebas, translated by F. G. Plaistowe. Crown 8vo. 40 pp. Clive. (Univ. Tut. Series.) 2s. 6d.
Aristoteles. Nicomachean Ethics. Books 1, 2, 3, 4, 10. Translated by F. Harvey. Crown 8vo. Oxford, H. Harvey. 3s. 6d.
Cicero. Pro Plancio, ed. with Introduction and Notes by H. W. Auden. 12mo. 234 pp. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.
Demosthenes. The first Philippic and the Olynthiacs, with Introduction and Notes by J. E. Sandys. 12mo. 320 pp. Macmillan. (Classical Series.) 5s.
Euripides. Troades, with Notes by R. Y. Tyrrell. 12mo. 150 pp. Macmillan. (Classical Series.) 2s. 6d.
Homer. Odyssey. Books 13-24, with Introduction and Notes by W. W. Merry. Crown 8vo. 394 pp. Frowde. 5s.
 — Snider (D. J.) Homer's Iliad with preliminary survey of the four Literary Bibles: a Commentary. 12mo. St. Louis. \$2.25.
Horace. Odes in English in the Original Metres, by P. E. Phelps. Crown 8vo. 34 pp. Parker. 4s. 6d.
Johnston (H. W.) Latin Manuscripts, an Elementary Introduction to the use of Critical Editions for High School and College Classes. 8vo. ii, 13 pp. Plates. Chicago. \$2.25.
 AORIA 'IHEOT. Sayings of our Lord from an early Greek Papyrus, discovered and edited with Translation and Commentary by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. 8vo. 20 pp., 2 plates. Boards. Egyptian Exploration Fund. 2s.
Mahaffy (J. F.) A survey of Greek Civilisation. Crown 8vo. 344 pp. Macmillan. 6s.
Merrill (E. T.) Fragments of Roman Satire from Ennius to Apuleius. 16mo. 178 pp. American Book Co. 75 cts.
Morris (W. O'Connor.) Hannibal, soldier, statesman, patriot, and the crisis of the struggle between Carthage and Rome. 12mo. xvi, 376 pp. Putnams. (Heroes of Nations Series.) \$1.50.
Pellison (M.) Roman Life in Pliny's time, from the French by Maud Wilkinson, with Introduction by F. J. Miller. 12mo. 315 pp., engravings. Meadville. \$1.
Platon. Phaedo, translated with test papers by A. E. Blagrove and C. S. Fearenside. Crown 8vo. 78 pp. Clive. (Univ. Tut. Series.) 2s. 6d.
Sophocles. Tragoediae, edited by R. Y. Tyrrell. Crown 8vo. Macmillan. (Parnassus Library.) 5s.
Tacitus. Histories, Book 3. Translation with test papers by J. D. Maillard. Crown 8vo. 68 pp. Clive. (Univ. Tut. Series.) 2s. 6d.
 — Dialogus de Oratoribus, with Prolegomena, Critical and Exegetical Commentary, Indexes, and a Bibliography by A. Gudeman. 8vo. xxxviii, 447 pp. Ginn. \$2.75.
Valerius Maximus. Selections from Anecdotes, with Vocabulary, Notes, and Exercises, by C. H. Ward. 18mo. 164 pp. Macmillan. (Elem. Classics.) 1s. 6d.
Xenophon. The fifth book of Xenophon's Anabasis, ed. by A. G. Rolfe. 16mo. v, 115 pp. Ginn. 45 cts.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Allard* (P.) Le christianisme et l'Empire romain de Néron à Théodose. 8vo. xii, 303 pp. Paris, Lecoffre. 3 frs. 50.
Anthologia lyrica sive lyricorum graecorum veterum praeter Pindarum reliquiae potiores, post Th. Bergkium IV edidit Ed. Hiller. Emend. et auxit O. Crusius. 12 mo. lxxvii, 387 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
Aristaeae quae fertur ad Philocratem epistulae initium (§§ 1-42 M. = pp. 13-23 Schm.) apparatu critico et commentario instructum ed. L. Mendelssohn. (Aus Acta et commentationes universitatis Jurevicensis. 8vo. iv, 52 pp. Jurievi. 1 Mk. 20.
Aristophanis Equites, rec. A. von Velsen. Ed. II., cur. K. Zacher. 8vo. xxii, 109 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
 — Plutus, expliqué littéralement, traduit en français et annoté par M. Cattant. 12 mo. 191 pp. Paris, Hachette. 2 frs. 25.
Aristoteles. Commentarii in Aristotelem graeca, edita consilio et auctoritate Academiae scientiarum Borussicae. Vol. XIV, pars II. (Joannis Philoponi in Aristotelis libros de generatione et corruptione commentaria, ed. H. Vitelli.) 8vo. x, 356 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 14 Mk.
 — Vahlen (J.) Hermeneutische Bemerkungen zu Aristoteles' Poetik. (Aus Sitzungsber. der Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin.) 8vo. 18 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.
Avienus. Le favole di Aviano, trascritte secondo il codice della biblioteca municipale di Reggio-Emilia da Ad. Levi. 8vo. 29 pp. Reggio-Emilia.
Batifol (P.) Anciennes littératures chrétiennes. La littérature grecque. 8vo. xvi, 347 pp. Paris, Lecoffre.
Beiträge (Philologisch-historische), Curt Wachsmuth zum 60. Geburtstag überreicht. 8vo. vii, 218 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
Blümner (Hugo) Satira. Ausgewählte Satiren des Horaz, Persius und Juvenal in freier metrischer Übertragung. 8vo. xix, 268 pp., 19 engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk.

- Brock* (A.) Quaestionum grammaticarum capita duo. 8vo. 184 pp. Jurievi (Dorpati). 3 Mk.
- Callimachi hymni et epigrammata*, iterum ed. U. de Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 8vo. 66 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 80 Pf.
- Cicero*. Schiche (Theo.) Zu Cicero's Briefwechsel während seiner Statthalterschaft von Cilicien. 4to. 27 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 1 Mk.
- Corpus inscriptionum graecarum Graeciae septentrionalis*. Vol. III, Fasc. I.: Inscriptiones graecae Phocidis, Locridis, Aetoliae, Acaernaliae, insularum maris Ionii, ed. Guil. Dittenberger. Folio. vii, 212 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 22 Mk. 50.
- Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*. Vol. L. (last.) Joannis Zonarae epitomae historiarum libri XVIII. ex rec. M. Pinderi. Tomus III (libri XIII.-XVIII.) Ed. Th. Büttner-Wobst. 8vo. xxi, 933 pp. Bonn, Weber. 24 Mk.
- Curtius* (Ernst.) Köhler (Ul.) Gedächtnissrede auf Ernst Curtius. (Aus Abhandlungen der Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin.) 4to. 14 pp. Berlin. 80 Pf.
- Dartigue-Perou* (J.) Marc Aurèle dans ses rapports avec le christianisme. 8vo. 239 pp. Paris, Fischbacher.
- Denkmäler griechischer und römischer Skulptur in historischer Anordnung. Unter Mitwirkung von Heint. Brunn herausgegeben von Fr. Bruckmann. Fortgesetzt von P. Arndt. Parts 92-93. Royal folio. 5 plates each part, Index 73 pp. Munich, Verlagsanstalt. 20 Mk. each part; Index 2 Mk.
- Dieterich* (Alb.) Pulcinella. Pompeianische Wandbilder und römische Satyrspiele. 8vo. x, 307 pp., 3 plates and engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 10 Mk.
- Dittmar* (A.) Studien zur lateinischen Moduslehre. 8vo. xi, 346 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 8 Mk.
- Dyloff* (Ad.) Die Ethik der alten Stoa untersucht. (Berliner Studien der class. Philologie von O. Seyffert. New Series. Vol. II, parts 2-4.) 8vo. xvi, 410 pp. Berlin, Calvary. 12 Mk. 50.
- Eudociae Augustae, Procli Lycii, Claudiani carminum graecorum reliquiae*, Acced. Blompomachiae fragmenta, rec. A. Ludwich. 8vo. vi, 241 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.
- Eusebius*. Eusèbe de Césarée, Histoire ecclésiastique, éditée (en Syriaque) par P. Bedjan. 8vo. viii, 598 pp. Paris. 20 Frs.
- Fränkel* (M.) Epigraphisches aus Aegina. (Aus Abhandl. der Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin.) 4to. 38 pp. Berlin. 2 Mk.
- Gerhard* (Ed.) Etruskische Spiegel. Vol. V., by A. Klügmann and G. Koerte. Part XV., XVI. (last.) 4to. 20 plates and letterpress, iv pp. and pages 181-237 with engravings. Berlin, Reimer. Each part 9 Mk.
- Greeven* (G.) Die Siglen D M auf alchristlichen Grabschriften und ihre Bedeutung. 8vo. 158 pp. Erlangen.
- Gruppe* (O.) Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte. Vol. I. (Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft von Iwan von Müller V, II, 1.) 8vo. 384 pp. Munich, Beck. 7 Mk.
- Hartwig* (P.) Bendis. Eine archaeologische Untersuchung. 4to. 4 ll., 27 pp., 8 engravings, 2 plates. Leipzig, Giesecke and D. 6 Mk.
- Haym* (C.) De puerorum in re scaenica Graecorum partibus. Part I. 8vo. 34 pp. Halle.
- Historia Augusta*. Lessing (C.) *Historiae Augustae lexicon*. Fasc. I. 4to. 24 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 1 Mk.
- Homeri Iliadis epitome* Fr. Hocheggeri. In usum scholarum ed. A. Scheindler. 2 partes. 12mo. xxxiv, 160; xxi, 259 pp. Vienna, Gerold. 2 Mk. 60.
- *L'Odyssée d'Homère Méléagène*. Traduite vers pour vers par le comte Ulysse de Séguier. 12mo. vi, 485 pp. Paris, Didot. 10 frs.
- *Gedichte*. Part III. Hilfsbuch, von O. Henke. Vol. II. Die Entstehung der homerischen Gedichte. Aus dem Gedankenschatz der Ilias. Altertümer. Der Kriegsschauplatz. Waffenwesen. Befestigungswesen. Kultus. Zur Psychologie und Ethic. 8vo. x, 198, plates and engravings. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- *Gloeckner* (Ferd.) Homerische Partikeln mit neuen Bedeutungen. Beiträge zur Lexicographie und zur Interpretation der homerischen Gedichte. Part I.: *ae*. 8vo. iii, 58 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 60.
- *Ludwich* (A.) Ueber Homercitate aus der Zeit von Aristarch bis Didymos. 4to. 41 pp. Königsberg. 30 Pf.
- Horace*. Staedler (K.) Horaz' Oden an seine Freunde in Reimstrophen verdeutscht. 4to. 31 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 1 Mk.
- *Pühringer* (A.) Horatiana sive de ratione, quae intercedit inter Horatium et poetas Lyricos Graecos. 8vo. 32 pp. Melk.
- Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, herausgegeben von Alfr. Fleckeisen. Suppl. Vol. XXIII, part 3. 8vo. iii and pp. 537-798. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 Mk. 40.
- Jung* (Jul.) Grundriss der Geographie von Italien und der Orbis Romanus. 2nd. ed. 8vo. viii, 178 pp. (Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft von Iwan von Müller III, 3, I.) Munich, Beck. 3 Mk. 50.
- Knoke* (F.) Die Kriegszüge des Germanicus in Deutschland. Supplement II. 8vo. 95 pp. 1 plate. Berlin, Gärtner. 2 Mk.
- Köhm* (J.) Quaestiones Plautinae Terentianaeque. 8vo. 56 pp. Giessen.
- Leo* (Fr.) Die plautinischen Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik. (Aus Abhandl. der Gesellsch. der Wiss. zu Göttingen.) 4to. 115 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 7 Mk. 50.
- Lindskog* (Cl.) Studien zum antiken Drama. 2 parts. 8vo. 175, 84, 26 pp. Lund. 5 Mk.
- Lucianus*. Chabert (S.) *L'Atticisme de Lucien*. 8vo. 249 pp. Paris, Oudin.
- Marcellus*. Chabert (S.) *De latinitate Marcelli in libro de medicamentis*. 8vo. 140 pp. Paris, Oudin.
- Müller* (F.) Beiträge zur etymologischen Erklärung der griechischen Sprache. (Aus Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissensch. zu Wien. 8vo. 40 pp. Wien, Gerold. 1 Mk.
- Neue* (Fr.) Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache. Vol III. Das Verbum. 3rd. ed., by C. Wagener. Parts 10, 11. (last.) 8vo. ii pp. and pages 577-664. Berlin, Calvary. 3 Mk. 20.
- Ovidii Carmina selecta*, ed. C. J. Grysar, recogn. C. Ziwsa. Ed. iv. 12mo. xxii, 296 pp. Vienna, Gerold. 1 Mk. 50.
- Paulcke* (M.) De tabula iliaca quaestiones Stesichoreae. 8vo. 100 pp. 1 plate. Königsberg. 2 Mk.
- Peter* (H.) Die griechische Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I. und ihre Quellen. 2 vols. 8vo. xi, 478; vi, 410 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 12 Mk.
- Phaedrus*. Vandaele (Hil.) *Qua mente Phaeder fabellas scripserit*. 8vo. iv, 105 pp. Paris, Bouillon. 3 Mk. 20.
- Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, recognoverunt L. Cohn et P. Wendland*. Ed. minor. Vol. II. 8vo. xiii, 306 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 2 Mk.

- Philippon* (A.) Thessalien und Epirus. Reisen und Forschungen im nördlichen Griechenland. 8vo. xi, 422 pp., 8 plates. Berlin, Kuhl. 12 Mk.
- Pichon* (R.) Histoire de la littérature latine. 12mo. xviii, 987 pp. Paris, Hachette. 5 frs.
- Pindari carmina cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis, iterum recogn.* W. Christ. 12mo. iv, 351 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Platon's ausgewählte Dialoge*, erklärt von H. Sauppe. Vol. III. Gorgias. Herausgegeben von A. Gercke. 8vo. I.-VI. 186 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk. 70.
- Hirmer* (Jos.) Entstehung und Composition der Platonischen Politeia. Aus Jahrbücher für class. Philologie, Suppl. Vol. XXIII. 8vo. 100 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 20.
- Potter* (E.) Vases antiques du Louvre, avec photographures et dessins de J. Devillard. Salles A—E: les origines, les styles; écoles rhodienne et corinthienne. 4to. Double columns, 67 pp., plates. Paris, Hachette. 30 frs.
- Reber* (Frz.) Die phrygischen Felsendenkmäler. Untersuchungen über Stil und Entstehungszeit. (Aus Abhandl. der Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.) 4to. 70 pp., 20 engravings, 12 plates. Munich, Franz. 8 Mk.
- Reich* (H.) Übungsbuch der griechischen Syntax. Part I. Die Syntax der Casus. 8vo. xi, 168 pp. Bamberg, Buchner. 2 Mk.
- Reissinger* (K.) Ueber Bedeutung und Verwendung der Präpositionen ob und propter im älteren Latein. Eine lexikalisch-semasiologische Untersuchung. 8vo. 82 pp. Erlangen.
- Sallust's Jugurthinischer Krieg.* Text für den Schulgebrauch von Th. Opitz. 12mo. vi, 101 pp., map. Leipzig, Teubner. 80 Pf.
- Schmid* (Wilh.) Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus. General Index. 8vo. iii, 234 pp. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer. 6 Mk.
- Schreiber* (Theo.) Die Wandbilder des Polygnotos in der Halle der Knidier zu Delphi. Vol. I. (Aus Abhandlungen der Sächs. Gesellschaft des Wissens. zu Leipzig.) 8vo. v, 179 pp., 18 engravings. Leipzig, Hirzel. 8 Mk.
- Simon* (J. A.) Exoterische Studien zur antiken Poesie, namentlich zu Horaz, Tibull und Ovid. Vol. I. Zur Anordnung der Oden, Epoden und Satiren des Horaz. 8vo. iv, 80 pp. Köln. 2 Mk.
- Sophocles.* Tragedies, traduites par M. Bellaguet. 12mo. xx, 356 pp. Paris, Hachette. 3 frs. 50.
- Kaibel (Geo.) De Sophoclis Antigona. 8vo. 27 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck. 50 Pf.
- Studien* (Leipziger) zur classischen Philologie. Herausgegeben von O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius, C. Wachsmuth. Vol. XVIII. Part I. 8vo. 208 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 8 Mk.
- Taciti de vita et moribus Julii Agricolae liber.* Texte soigneusement revu, avec introduction et notes par L. Constans et P. Girbal. 8vo. 80 pp., map. Paris, Delagrave.
- de situ ac populis Germaniae liber. Texte soigneusement revu, avec introduction et notes par L. Constans et P. Girbal. 8vo. 100 pp., map. Paris, Delagrave.
- Dialogue des orateurs, traduit par Burnouf. Texte expliqué et revu par P. Le Nestour. 12mo. 303 pp. Paris, Hachette. 2 frs.
- Gerber (A.) et A. Greef. Lexicon Taciteum Fasc. xiii, 8vo. Pp. 1377-1488. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk. 60.
- Groag (E.) Zur Kritik von Tacitus' Quellen in den Historien. (Aus Jahrbücher für class. Philologie, Suppl. Vol. XXIII.) 8vo. 42 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 80.
- Kubik (J.) Readerklärung und Anschauungsunterricht bei der Lectüre des Tacitus. 8vo. 86 pp. Vienna, Holder. 2 Mk.
- Toeppfer* (Jo.) Beiträge zur griechischen Alterthumswissenschaft. 8vo. xvi, 384 pp., engraving. Berlin, Weidmann. 10 Mk.
- Vergilii Maronis Aeneidos epitome.* Acced. ex Georgicis et Bucolicis delectus, ed. E. Hoffmann. 4th ed. 12 mo. 266 pp. Vienna, Gerold. 1 Mk. 40.
- Jahn (P.) Ueber die Abhängigkeit Vergils von Theocrit. 4to. 29 pp. Berlin, Gaertner. 1 Mk.
- Weise* (P.) Ueber den Weinbau der Römer. Part I. 4to. 21 pp. Hamburg. 2 Mk. 50.
- Wilkowski* (Stan.) Prodrum grammaticae papyrorum graecarum aetatis Lagidaurum. 8vo. 65 pp. Krakau. 3 Mk.
- Xenophon.* Gemoll (W.) Bemerkungen zu Xenophon's Anabasis. 8vo. 42 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
- (Aus 'Jahrbücher für class. Philologie,' Suppl. Vol. XXIII.)
- Ziebarth* (E.) Neue attische Hypothekeninschriften. 8vo. 12 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf.
- (Aus 'Sitzungsber. der Akad. der Wissensch. zu Berlin.')